Lake English Classics

WASHINGTON WEBSTER AND LINCOLN

DENNEY

S
S2
04
920

LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA
COLLEGE

PS 662 .D4 1920 4022

Washington, Webster and
Lincoln

PS 662 .D4 1920 4022

Washington, Webster and
Lincoln

ANDERSON UNIVERSITY
PS662 .D4 1920 *4022!
INAN
Washington, Webster and Lincoln : selections for t
[redacted]
3 2197 00085 4022

Date Due

5

The Lake English Classics

General Editor

LINDSAY TODD DAMON, A.B.

Professor of English in Brown University

ADDISON—*Sir Roger de Coverley Papers*—ABBOTT
ADDISON AND STEELE—*Selections from The Tatler and The Spectator*—ABBOTT
ÆNEID OF VIRGIL—ALLINSON
AUSTEN—*Pride and Prejudice*
BROWNING—*Selected Poems*—REYNOLDS
BUILDERS OF DEMOCRACY—GREENLAW
BUNYAN—*The Pilgrim's Progress*—LATHAM
BURKE—*Speech on Conciliation with Collateral Readings*—WARD.
BURNS—*Selected Poems* and **CARLYLE**—*Essay on Burns*—MARSH
CHAUCER—*Selections*—GREENLAW
COLERIDGE—*The Ancient Mariner*
LOWELL—*Vision of Sir Launfal* } 1 vol.—MOODY
COOPER—*The Last of the Mohicans*—LEWIS
COOPER—*The Spy*—DAMON
DANA—*Two Years Before the Mast*—WESTCOTT
DEFOE—*Robinson Crusoe*—HASTINGS
Democracy Today—GAUSS
DE QUINCEY—*Joan of Arc and Selections*—MOODY
DE QUINCEY—*The Flight of a Tartar Tribe*—FRENCH.
DICKENS—*A Christmas Carol, etc.*—BROADUS
DICKENS—*A Tale of Two Cities*—BALDWIN
DICKENS—*David Copperfield*—BALDWIN
DRYDEN—*Palamon and Arcite*—COOK
EMERSON—*Essays and Addresses*—HEYDRICK
English Poems—*From* POPE, GRAY, GOLDSMITH, COLERIDGE, BYRON, MACAULAY, ARNOLD, *and others*—SCUDDER
English Popular Ballads—HART
Essays—ENGLISH AND AMERICAN—ALDEN
Familiar Letters—GREENLAW
FRANKLIN—*Autobiography*—GRIFFIN
French Short Stories—SCHWEIKERT
GASKELL (Mrs.)—*Cranford*—HANCOCK
GEORGE ELIOT—*Silas Marner*—HANCOCK
GEORGE ELIOT—*The Mill on the Floss*—WARD
GOLDSMITH—*The Vicar of Wakefield*—MORTON
HAWTHORNE—*The House of the Seven Gables*—HERRICK
HAWTHORNE—*Twice-Told Tales*—HERRICK AND BRUERE
HUGHES—*Tom Brown's School Days*—DE MILLE
IRVING—*Life of Goldsmith*—KRAPP
IRVING—*The Sketch Book*—KRAPP
IRVING—*Tales of a Traveller*—and parts of *The Sketch Book*—KRAPP

LAMB—*Essays of Elia*—BENEDICT
LONGFELLOW—*Narrative Poems*—POWELL
LOWELL—*Vision of Sir Launfal*—See Coleridge
MACAULAY—*Essays on Addison and Johnson*—NEWCOMER
MACAULAY—*Essays on Clive and Hastings*—NEWCOMER
MACAULAY—*Goldsmith, Frederic the Great, Madame D'Arblay*—NEWCOMER
MACAULAY—*Essays on Milton and Addison*—NEWCOMER
MILTON—*L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, Comus, and Lycidas*—NEILSON
MILTON—*Paradise Lost*, Books I and II—FARLEY
Old Testament Narratives—RHODES
One Hundred Narrative Poems—TETER
PALGRAVE—*Golden Treasury*—NEWCOMER
PARKMAN—*The Oregon Trail*—MACDONALD
POE—*Poems and Tales, Selected*—NEWCOMER
POPE—*Homer's Iliad*, Books I, VI, XXII, XXIV—CRESSY AND MOODY
READE—*The Cloister and The Hearth*—DE MILLE
RUSKIN—*Sesame and Lilies*—LINN
Russian Short Stories—SCHWEIKERT
SCOTT—*Ivanhoe*—SIMONDS
SCOTT—*Quentin Durward*—SIMONDS
SCOTT—*Lady of the Lake*—MOODY
SCOTT—*Lay of the Last Minstrel*—MOODY AND WILLARD
SCOTT—*Marmion*—MOODY AND WILLARD
SHAKSPERE—*The Neilson Edition*—Edited by W. A. NEILSON,

As You Like It
Hamlet
Henry V
Julius Caesar
Macbeth
Midsummer-Night's Dream
Romeo and Juliet
The Tempest
Twelfth Night

SHAKSPERE—*Merchant of Venice*—LOVETT
SOUTHEY—*Life of Nelson*—WESTCOTT
STEVENSON—*Inland Voyage and Travels with a Donkey*—LEONARD
STEVENSON—*Kidnapped*—LEONARD
STEVENSON—*Treasure Island*—BROADUS
TENNYSON—*Selected Poems*—REYNOLDS
TENNYSON—*The Princess*—COPELAND
THOREAU—*Walden*—BOWMAN
THACKERAY—*Henry Esmond*—PHELPS
THACKERAY—*English Humorists*—CUNLIFFE AND WATT
Three American Poems—*The Raven, Snow-Bound, Miles Standish*—GREEVER
Types of the Short Story—HEYDRICK
Washington, Webster, Lincoln—DENNEY

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
CHICAGO: 623 S. Wabash Ave. NEW YORK: 8 East 34th Street

11775

The Lake English Classics

REVISED EDITION WITH HELPS TO STUDY

WASHINGTON, WEBSTER, AND LINCOLN

SELECTIONS FOR
THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE ENGLISH
REQUIREMENTS

EDITED BY
JOSEPH VILLIERS DENNEY
PROFESSOR IN THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
CHICAGO NEW YORK

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA

COPYRIGHT 1910, 1920
BY SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA

ROBERT O. LAW COMPANY
EDITION BOOK MANUFACTURERS
CHICAGO, U. S. A.

PS
662
.D4
1920

PREFACE

American speeches have always been studied enthusiastically by Americans; not primarily because of their literary value, but because of their satisfying statement of American ideals. The words of Washington, Webster, and Lincoln express the national aspiration in ways that are forever memorable. Their phrases have passed into maxims and into the daily speech of their countrymen. The appeal they make is to the historical imagination. Consequently they can be appreciated best by those who bring to the reading the fullest knowledge of the historical events and governmental principles to which they refer. For this reason the notes explain, or put the student in the way of explaining for himself, the leading historical ideas with which Washington, Webster, and Lincoln deal in their addresses. But while the interest in these addresses is primarily historical, the editor has not neglected the literary and rhetorical phase of the study. To this phase are devoted a part of the introduction and a considerable body of the notes.

Macaulay's speech on copyright is printed in the appendix as affording excellent material for brief-making. For this purpose the brief of Lincoln's address at Cooper Institute (p. 195) may be used as a model.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, January, 1910.

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA
~~11775~~
4022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE 5

INTRODUCTION:

Occasions for Speaking 9
Kinds of Public Address 10
The Oral Quality 14
Fashions in Public Address 15
Methods 17
The Parts of a Discourse 19
1. The Introduction 20
2. The Discussion 23
Outline of the Bunker Hill Monument Address ... 24
3. The Conclusion 34

TEXT:

Farewell Address ..... *George Washington* 35
The Character of Washington .. *Daniel Webster* 56
The Bunker Hill Monument .... *Daniel Webster* 74
Address at Cooper Institute .... *Abraham Lincoln* 100
Speech at Independence Hall ... *Abraham Lincoln* 128
First Inaugural Address ..... *Abraham Lincoln* 130
Letter to Horace Greeley ..... *Abraham Lincoln* 143
Speech at Gettysburg ..... *Abraham Lincoln* 145
Second Inaugural Address ..... *Abraham Lincoln* 146
Last Public Address ..... *Abraham Lincoln* 149
Abraham Lincoln ..... *"The Spectator"* 155

CONTENTS

TEXT *(continued)*: PAGE

Speech on Copyright.....*Thomas Babington Macaulay*..... 163

NOTES 184

HELPS TO STUDY..... 215

THEME SUBJECTS..... 221

SELECTIONS FOR CLASS READING..... 222

INTRODUCTION.

OCCASIONS FOR SPEAKING.

It is often said that oratory is on the decline. The occasions are rare, we are told, when there is a real demand for it. The newspaper, the magazine, and the popular novel have come, usurping the function performed by the orator of the olden time. When, as in our day, many can write and practically all can read, why should any speak? It is doubtless true that oratory —in the sense of heightened appeal to the feelings—is not so often heard as formerly. It has almost disappeared from legislative halls and has become less frequent in courts of law and in some other places where it once flourished. But in the meantime, in these and a thousand other places, public speech of a less pretentious and less ardent sort,—addressed primarily not to the feelings, but to the reason,—has become almost a daily necessity. This increase in the number of situations calling for public address is due to the complexity of modern life. All of our professions and trades, all of our enterprises,—political, religious, philanthropic, educational, and social,—even our pleasures and sports, are highly organized. Each has its stated meetings, each its occasions for the oral communication of ideas and feelings. There probably never was a time when these occasions were half so numerous as they are today. As a result, the art of public speech has become less of a profession, less a matter of set rules and formulæ, less

the possession of a particular class of people exclusively devoted to its cultivation, and more of a staple need of the many. A good reason, this, why every educated person should wish to learn more about it. Carlyle congratulated the English on the fact that they were a nation of poor speakers. He thought that the less talking there was, the greater would be the amount of useful work accomplished. But since some talking is inevitable in order that work may be directed into channels that are worth while, it seems a strange reason for pride in any nation, or in any individual, that the thing is done poorly. Carlyle's friend, Emerson, had a better word for his countrymen, when he wrote that "if there ever was a country where eloquence was a power, it is in the United States. Here is room for every degree of it, on every one of its ascending stages,—that of useful speech in our commercial, manufacturing, railroad, and educational conventions; that of political advice and persuasion on the grandest theatre, reaching, as all good men trust, into a vast future, and so compelling the best thought and noblest administrative ability that the citizen can offer. And here are the services of science, the demands of art, and the lessons of religion, to be brought home to the instant practice of thirty millions of people. Is it not worth the ambition of every generous youth to train and arm his mind with all the resources of knowledge, of method, of grace, and of character, to serve such a constituency?"

KINDS OF PUBLIC ADDRESS.

In the quotation just given, Emerson suggests a classification of speeches. The principle of his classification is the relative importance of their subject-matter.

His first division includes utterances of immediate practical utility, utterances that deal with affairs and that deal with affairs mainly on the matter-of-fact basis; beginning with commerce, but rising successively to the larger interests involved in manufacturing, in the railroad problem, in education. His second division includes those utterances that touch our political interests. It is higher than the first because here we have to deal not merely with matters of fact, but with matters of national sentiment and aspiration; consequently there is here offered a broader field for the element of advice and persuasion. His third division includes those utterances that deal with man's most vital interests, speeches of which the end is to render science, art, or religion most serviceable,—to make them a part of the life of every man. Here the field for the element of persuasion is widest. It is clear that Emerson's classification will apply equally well to written discourse and that it covers the field. It is as specific also as a classification of so many species can be made and remain a true classification. It would not be difficult to place any speech in one of Emerson's three divisions.

A classification on an entirely different principle was made by Aristotle. His principle of classification is the attitude of the audience toward the speech. Audiences, he says, are either judges of things done in the past, as are legal judges and juries; or they are judges of things proposed for the future, as are legislative or political assemblies; or they are judges of the speech itself considered merely as a work of art. Hence Aristotle classifies oratory as (1) judicial, or the oratory of the bar, the aim of which is the securing or protecting of personal rights by convincing and persuading judges and juries; (2) deliberative, or the oratory before con-

ventions, assemblies, legislatures, and public meetings, political, religious, commercial, or educational; and (3) epideictic, or the oratory of display, now more frequently called occasional oratory, under which heading modern writers who follow Aristotle have put practically all secular speaking that is not easily classified as judicial or deliberative,—the eulogy, the anniversary address, the dedicatory address, the popular lecture, the commencement address, the after-dinner speech, etc. To all this it is necessary to add (4) pulpit oratory, a species that has appeared since Aristotle wrote. The mere statement of this classification reveals its remoteness from modern life and its insufficiency as a classification of the multifarious public speaking of our day. The basis of the Aristotelian division is the mental attitude of the audience. But the psychology of audiences is not so simple a matter as this four-fold division assumes it to be. Emerson once called attention to the undoubted fact that every audience is composed of many audiences; that the speaker finds himself addressing now one, now another, of these lesser audiences; that very rarely, if ever, may a homogeneous state of mind be presumed in all listeners; that the very same listener may be successively in several mental attitudes during the same address. The principle by which orations are to be classified cannot, then, be a principle based solely upon a homogeneous state of mind which probably does not exist. It is clear, too, that the state of mind appealed to by a deliberative oration may be, perversely enough, that which this classification assigns exclusively to judicial oratory. Modern pulpit oratory, also, may be, and often is, judicial or deliberative in spirit; it may look either to the past or to the future. The epideictic was thought

by the Greeks to be best illustrated in the eulogy and the invective; but surely it is not just to regard these as forms of display and to judge them solely by artistic considerations. Even the modern oratorical contest, which is most often accused of being purely epideictic, rejects as inadequate this basis of judgment and demands a judgment based upon the value of the thought as well as upon the style and the delivery. In spite of all this, the psychological fact on which Aristotle based his classification remains true,—that a speaker must *consider* his audience and must try to adapt his material to what he supposes the mental state of a majority of his listeners to be. The ideal standard of speech thus becomes not mere self-expression, for self-expression implies no thought of the audience; but rather self-*communication,* which implies a constant effort to carry our ideas over to those who listen to us. This ideal standard we owe to Aristotle.

A third classification divides spoken discourse, as written discourse is usually divided, into descriptive, narrative, expository, and argumentative. The principle of division here is the rhetorical process employed. This classification makes no attempt to describe a eulogy, or a sermon, or a speech at the bar, or an after-dinner speech, or any other kind of speech, as a distinct species having a quality of its own that no other species possesses. It assumes that the vital characteristic of any utterance is not indicated by its popular class label. It assumes that eulogies, sermons, and the rest, differ so widely in variety and method, that no class characteristic that is at once useful and true can be found for each of them. But every speech may be examined for its rhetorical process, and this examination will show the fundamental types of oral discourse. This classification,

too, is imperfect; for a speech that is descriptive may use, as accessory to its purpose, narration, exposition, or argument, as it needs; and so with the others. The truth is that we must keep in mind all three of the systems of classification when studying any speech,—Emerson's, Aristotle's, and that of the rhetoricians,—if we would arrive at anything like a complete judgment; for (1) we must think of the importance of the subject-matter as Emerson thought of it; (2) we must think of the speech as an effort at communication with a certain audience, as Aristotle thought of it; and (3) we must think of the effectiveness of the process employed, as the rhetoricians enjoin.

THE ORAL QUALITY.

Whatever their classification, most successful speeches have one marked characteristic in common. Even when reduced to print, they appeal primarily not to the eye but to the ear. The attentive reader feels called upon in imagination to hear a speech as he reads it. If his mind is active he images also the speaker, the audience, the occasion; and is impelled to find out as much as possible about the feelings that ruled the hearts of men when it was delivered. He is ready to make concessions to cover the loss which the spoken sentence may suffer when printed. A printed extemporaneous address when read critically will usually show faults of phrasing that were doubtless overlooked by those listeners who shared the speaker's feelings. Speech has an excellence of its own, entirely apart from its literary quality. Moreover, in the leisure of reading, we often take pleasure in a certain subtlety and fineness of statement; we like to make our own inferences; we accept mere hints of what we are expected to think, and we have time to suspend

reading, if need be, in order to make sure of our ground. In spoken discourse, there is no time for this. The speaker must move forward to his conclusion by a simple plan and a directness of statement that leaves no doubts pending. A speech may have all of the literary virtues and may yet fail for lack of simplicity of structure and the easy intelligibility which comes from direct idiomatic statement. Having these latter, together with energy and insight into the meaning of the occasion, a speech will be effective, though it lack grace, suggestiveness, refinement, and even strict grammatical accuracy. We prize in a speech certain of the qualities of good conversation,—unpretentiousness, short and pointed phrasing—but not its waywardness; in a speech we look for the straight-forward march to partial and complete conclusions. These characteristics of speech, which may be called the oral (or, equally well, the *aural*) quality, are forced upon the speaker by the immediate presence of his audience. Some writers, too, are keenly conscious, while composing, of those whom they are addressing; they hear each sentence as they put it on paper. Their writing is essentially oral although it may never be spoken. Many an open letter or newspaper editorial, sometimes even a state paper, has this oral quality. Some spoken discourses lack it; they are essays rather than speeches, addressed to the eye rather than to the ear.

FASHIONS IN PUBLIC ADDRESS.

While the notion of addressing a specific audience, with its resultant (the cultivation of the oral quality) has persisted since the days of Aristotle, and is, indeed, the explanation of the present ideal of public speech,—effective self-communication,—it is equally true that

fashions have changed in this as in the other arts. The essential worth and dignity of the old classical oratory cannot be questioned; yet its manner would by many be accounted mannerism today. For instance, public taste at the present time is somewhat intolerant of any but the most indirect and carefully disguised attempts at emotional appeal. We want the facts: the facts, we think, carry their own appeal; having the facts, we think that we know how to feel about them. Hence arises the greater share of the intellectual element in the speeches of today as compared with those of former times; and the more scrupulous regard for accuracy of statement. Hence, too, has come about the gradual abandonment of certain fashions that were once prevalent, and the adoption of new fashions. It was once the fashion, for example, for a young lawyer addressing a jury to refer humbly to his youth and inexperience, or to eulogize the jury system. It was once the fashion for a skillful speaker to apologize for a pretended lack of skill. It was once the fashion always to emphasize the importance of the subject, even though every one appreciated its importance. These things were not insincerities; they were the conventions of the moment; they were expected. It is the fashion today to do none of these things, to take much for granted, and (whether intrinsically a good fashion or not) to get speedily to the essential point to be presented, with very little preliminary or introductory matter. The fear of delay, the fear of over-formality, which prevails among speakers today, while generally wholesome, is doubtless the cause of a certain abruptness, nervousness, and undue haste, that are often noticeable in contemporary speaking. We have rid ourselves of indirection, and of tardiness in taking hold of our theme; but we

have sacrificed something of ease and grace in the process. To be always relentlessly business-like, direct, and practical in speech, may itself, at some future time, be criticised as a mannerism of the present age. There is, however, in modern speeches, a nicer adjustment of the time-element to the importance of the message. Economy of time has become a paramount consideration. Speakers today usually know, beforehand, how much time they are expected to occupy, and govern themselves accordingly.

METHODS.

Not only do oratorical fashions change from age to age, but at any given moment there are marked differences of method. Among the Greeks, for instance, most of the orators and teachers insisted upon elevation of thought and sentiment, with diction to match, as essential to a good speech; but then, as now, there were successful speakers who, like Andocides, professed a contempt for the rules of rhetoric and for any serious study of the art which they themselves practised; who paid little attention to arranging their material in an orderly way; who relied on a fund of good stories to help them in times of need; and who advised speakers to trust to their native gifts, and to the inspiration of the occasion. There were some, like Hyperides, who advocated a conversational manner, the plainest of plain speech, and a large use of colloquialism, in opposition to those who advised the cultivation of a more dignified, stately, or highly ornate diction. Some studied the art of the public actors in order to learn "the outer signs of eloquence" and thus cultivated a theatrical manner of speaking; others, disdaining this as shallow trickery, studied the art of being artless. There were those, however, who advocated

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA
4029

the sound principle that the cultivation of the "inner spirit,"—the systematic and prolonged education of the mind and heart, the achievement of a strong character, —should precede and accompany the study of the "outer signs." Many followed Æschines in practising written composition assiduously and in studying general literature and philosophy, as essential elements in the education of a speaker. Demosthenes, the greatest of Greek orators, illustrated the value of unremitting and purposeful labor. In order to overcome defects of voice, articulation, breathing, and physical manner, he imposed upon himself arduous exercises through a series of years; he watched the ways of the actors and of other professional speakers, and imitated them in those points which seemed appropriate to his own personality and temperament. He gave seven years of his life to practising written composition and to studies in history, law, and statesmanship. Believing that he could win no lasting success without worthy thinking, he endeavored in all of his studies to find out what was fundamentally right and not merely what was expedient, in order that, throughout his life, he might habitually and unconsciously apply the highest test to every question that he might be called upon to discuss. In thus devoting himself primarily to gaining sound knowledge and to developing moral earnestness, while steadily learning, through practice and a study of models, the approved modes of speech that were suitable to himself as an individual, he set for all time the example of a sound method of training for effective self-communication on any subject of discussion; a method involving first, adequate knowledge of the facts to be discussed; secondly, the ability and the disposition to apply principles of right and wrong to the facts as

ascertained; thirdly, attention to the best way of presenting the matter. The Greek and Latin writers on public speaking devoted a great deal of discussion to the first and second of these points. Later writers have said less about these, devoting their attention almost exclusively to the art of presentation; but always assuming the preëminent importance of knowledge and sincerity.

THE PARTS OF A DISCOURSE.

The usual division of any discourse is into (1) introduction (see pp. 20-23), (2) discussion (pp. 23-34), and (3) conclusion (p. 34). These terms suggest little more than beginning, middle, end. The ancient writers enumerated the following as parts of an address: introduction, the narration or exposition, the proposition, the confirmation, the refutation, the conclusion; and some added the excursus or digression. This minuter division is still useful as indicating certain elements that enter or may enter into the make-up of a speech, certain functions to be performed, or, for good reason, to be consciously left unperformed. In most argumentative discourses, for example, a formal narration or exposition of facts, as a separate part, preliminary to the proposition and the confirmation of proof, is unnecessary: yet the element of narration or exposition will appear at any stage of the discourse as needed. Likewise proof and refutation may or may not constitute the main body of a discourse: in a discourse that is essentially narrative or expository, argument may be absent altogether, while in others there is nothing but argument. The proposition, or, if there be no proposition, the subject, can hardly be considered a part of discourse, yet its enumeration with the parts points clearly to the need

of some unifying element in every discourse; and indeed the excursus, or the digression, an element now almost universally condemned as lacking all excuse for being, was originally offered in answer to the human need of relief from too strict an adherence to the logic of the subject and as an opportunity for the speaker to unburden his mind on any matter that logic would exclude from his discourse. We shall adopt as parts of discourse the introduction, the discussion, and the conclusion; and, in the treatment of each, we shall ask what elements may properly enter into its make-up.

1. The Introduction. The work of the introduction is to provide all that is needed by way of preliminary information and in order to secure a favorable disposition towards the ideas that are to follow in the discussion. Ancient writers, however, restricted the introduction to the work of gaining the active good will of the audience. They assigned to another part of the discourse the work of giving preliminary information. The chief function of the introduction, they thought, is to overcome hostility in the mind of the audience, should hostility exist; to win attention, and to create an interest in the subject, leaving no hearer in a state of indifference. One of the best recommendations of Aristotle may be stated thus: the way to gain good will is to show good will. In general, good will is made apparent in modern speeches, more often in the tone and spirit of the opening than in any direct statement.

A second method of gaining good will is the appeal, direct or indirect, to community of interest, or to class or party spirit. The tacit assumption in this appeal is that because speaker and audience are of the same nationality, church, political party, school, club, social

class, trade, profession, or other occupation, enjoy the same intellectual pursuits, or even the same sports, they will be inclined to agree in all matters. Webster, eulogizing Washington, naturally touches the chord of patriotism; and at the outset of the Monument Address he voices the common feeling as he conceives it. His second paragraph is devoted exclusively to the patriotic note.

While showing good will, however, while seeking to identify himself with his audience, the speaker must not surrender any of his convictions or any of his self-respect. As Aristotle long ago pointed out, a speaker commends himself chiefly by his good judgment and reasonableness, by his reliance on his own worth and the worth of his message. But modern taste forbids him to assert his good qualities. A speaker's reasonableness, his worth, his virtue, or strength, declare themselves in his treatment of his theme. The personal introduction in political or other controversy, however, is still common, and, indeed, is unavoidable when the speaker has been made the object of criticism and thus has himself become part of the matter at issue. It is used with a fine reticence in Washington's Farewell Address and with solemn effectiveness in Lincoln's Independence Hall address. But, excepting instances of obvious necessity, like those just named, the personal introduction will not often suggest itself in these days as an easy or appropriate method of beginning.

Closely related to the personal introduction, and often employed in connection with it, is the introduction based upon the importance of the subject. As a general rule in modern addresses the importance of the subject is a thing to be assumed rather than directly asserted. The importance of the subject is either self-evident at the outset or is to be made evident by the whole discourse.

It should be recognized by the audiences as a result of the speech, rather than declared by the speaker at the beginning.

Probably the easiest and most economical introductions are those which are based on some pertinent remark that has been made by another. An introduction of this kind seems to continue a discussion already begun in people's minds, and offers a point of departure either in harmony with the quoted sentiment or in contrast with it. The introduction by anecdote belongs to this class.

Whatever the subject matter chosen for the introduction it must, in order to suit the modern taste, bear close relevance to the theme of the discourse. The irrelevant introduction advocated by some, practised by many, may be attractive in itself, but it arouses expectations that are destined not to be fulfilled, and its final effect, when it is recalled by a hearer, is to diminish the total influence of the speech. Nowhere is there greater danger, than in the introduction, of violating unity of tone. If the introduction is keyed at too high an elevation of thought or feeling or is too finely finished, the speaker may later find himself unable to maintain the level on which he started and the decline to a lower level is sure to be disappointing. Speakers of experience are usually wary of this danger and prefer to begin on a level from which it will not be difficult to rise as the essential parts of the discourse are taken up. The summit of an inclined plane is not a good point of departure in any discourse. The splendid introductions of Webster must have put many of his first hearers in fear that no man, however great, could begin on so high a plane and maintain himself there for long.

The usual advice to the inexperienced is to prepare

the introduction after the body of the discourse has been written. The advice is sound if understood as a warning against a pretentious, a trite, or a far-fetched introduction, or against one that for any reason is out of tune with the prevailing note of the discourse. The further advice that if an appropriate introduction has not suggested itself by the time the body of the discourse is completed, all attempt at introduction should be given up, is also sound. Earlier writers on oratory provided for this very contingency by naming one of their varieties of introduction "the abrupt beginning." To this advice may be added the reminder, contained in a word of Walter Bagehot's, that excepting in times of great excitement an audience begins to listen in a decidedly "factish" frame of mind. At the outset it prefers the particular rather than the general, facts rather than principles, the specific instance rather than the universal truth, the intellectual rather than the emotional.

2. The Discussion. The main body of an address includes one or more of the following elements: (1) a division or partition of the subject, (2) definition, (3) narration, description, or exposition, (4) proofs and refutation. The order in which these things appear in an address is determined by the nature of the address. One or more of them may in many cases be omitted altogether. Attention to the first will always be necessary.

(1) The division or partition of the material is not often formally announced in the finished address, as was once the custom. When it is so announced it is usually accounted a part of the introduction. Yet it is with the organization of the body of the discourse that the partition is concerned; and, in any event, there must be in the preparation of a discussion a division or par-

tition of the material with a view to orderly presentation. Waiving the question whether the partition is at the end of the introduction or at the beginning of the discussion, we may say that the best division is the simplest and most natural, with each part distinct from the others, yet with all the parts standing in intelligible relationship to one another and to the main idea. In spoken more than in written discourse, the plan must be perfectly clear, because the hearer has no time to think back over the speech in order to consider relationships of ideas. He is occupied with the passing word.

As an illustration of the value of a clear, self-consistent partition, let us study the underlying structure of Webster's Bunker Hill Monument Speech. The speech is of the expository class; there is no debatable proposition; there is only a subject and an occasion requiring a voice to express its dominant mood. The plan which follows fails, of course, to reproduce what is most characteristic and valuable in the speech, the element of personality, the emotional uplift; but it shows the chief ideas in their relationship.

Outline of the Bunker Hill Monument Address.

INTRODUCTION.

1. Impressiveness of the occasion (p. 74, ll. 1-8).
2. Patriotic memories and hopes peculiar to Americans inspired (p. 74, l. 9—p. 76, l. 17).
   - I. By the significance to them of the date and place (p. 74, l. 9—p. 75, l. 7).
   - II. By the significance to them of the discovery of America (p. 75, ll. 8-23).

III. By the significance to them of colonial history (p. 75, l. 24—p. 76, l. 8).

IV. By the significance to them of the Revolution (p. 76, ll. 9-17).

DISCUSSION.

A. Purposes of the Society in providing for the Monument (p. 76, l. 18—p. 77, l. 2).

I. Not that a monument is necessary, but to show our appreciation of the deeds of our ancestors, to keep alive similar sentiments and to foster a regard for the principles of the Revolution (p. 77, ll. 3-26).

II. Not to cherish hostility or the military spirit, but to express our sense of the benefits which have come through the events commemorated (p. 77, l. 27—p. 78, l. 29).

B. Mighty events in America and Europe since the Revolution (p. 78, l. 30—p. 80, l. 18).

C. Apostrophe to the survivors of the Revolution (p. 80, l. 19—p. 81, l. 20).

D. Tribute to the patriotic dead (p. 81, l. 21—p. 82, l. 1), especially to Warren (p. 82, l. 2—p. 82, l. 19).

E. Address to the living survivors (p. 82, l. 20—p. 83, l. 23).

F. The unity of spirit in the Colonies and the effect of the Battle of Bunker Hill, especially upon La Fayette (p. 83, l. 24—p. 87, l. 25).

G. Eulogy on La Fayette (p. 87, l. 26—p. 89, l. 7).

H. Improvement in the world since the Battle of Bunker Hill, especially in politics and government (p. 89, l. 8).

I. Diffusion of knowledge and community of ideas; with results (p. 89, l. 23—p. 90, l. 33).

II. Difference between the Revolution in America and the French Revolution (p. 91, l. 28).

a. America was accustomed to representative government (p. 92, ll. 4-30).

b. Europe was a stranger to the popular principle (p. 92, l. 31—p. 93, l. 4).

c. Europe has, however, gained by the change (p. 93, ll. 4-21).

(1) Everywhere there is a desire for popular government (p. 93, ll. 22-32).

III. The influence of world opinion upon arbitrary governments (p. 93, l. 33—p. 94, l. 19). The case of Greece (p. 94, l. 20—p. 95, l. 33).

IV. The rise of independent states in South America (p. 95, l. 34—p. 97, l. 6).

I. The influence of the example of America (p. 97, l. 7).

I. It proves that free government may be safe and just (p. 97, ll. 13-19).

II. If we fail, free government will perish from the earth (p. 97, l. 20—p. 98, l. 2).

III. Free government may be as permanent as any other (p. 98, ll. 3-13).

CONCLUSION.

The duty of America is to preserve what the fathers won and to increase the spirit of union.

This analysis shows that Webster is in complete control of his material; he divides it as he will, for the subject and the occasion do not rigidly prescribe what points he shall take up. There is no logical proposition to impose requirements upon him in the matter of division, subdivision, and proof. To be sure we may reduce the whole address to the form of a syllogism if we wish:

Major Premise. All true patriots who have made sacrifices that their country might furnish to the world an illustrious example of freedom, good government and prosperity, should be gratefully honored by their countrymen.

Minor Premise. The heroes of the American Revolution have made sacrifices that their country might, etc.

Conclusion. The heroes of the American Revolution should be gratefully honored by their countrymen. Nothing is gained, however, by applying this strict logical test to an address the chief aim of which is not to prove a proposition, but to deepen feeling and to increase appreciation. To treat it as we treat an argumentative discourse is to reduce it to a string of platitudes, and to miss all that gives it distinction.

It is to be noted, however, that while Webster is free to select what topics he wishes, we find no waywardness or eccentricity in the selection. The topics are eminently appropriate to the subject and the occasion; each is distinct from the others; each follows the preceding topic naturally. As we pass from one to the next we are made to feel their relationship. In some cases it is a relationship of similarity or contrast; the apostrophe to the survivors (C) suggests the tribute to the patriotic dead (D) and this in turn suggests the address to the living (E). In other cases it is a relationship of cause and effect; the eulogy of LaFayette (G) follows as a natural effect of the facts cited just before under (F); the apostrophe to the survivors (C) is the natural effect of the recital of the mighty events referred to under (B); the improvement in the world (H) is the effect of the diffusion of knowledge and community of ideas (H-I); the difference between the Revolution in America and in Europe (H-II) is accounted for by a recital of causes (H-II a-b). In still other cases it is a relationship neither of similarity and contrast nor of cause and effect, but ideas follow one another because they are felt to be in contiguity, that is near to one another,

either near in time, as in the narrative portions, or near in thought. The influence of world opinion upon arbitrary governments (H-III) is near in thought to the preceding topic, the desire for popular government everywhere; the case of Greece suggests the case of the states of South America (IV). Thus it is easy to account for the position of each topic in the discussion and to find a reason why it is where we find it.

We notice also the use of climax in the arrangement of the divisions. The first climax is reached at p. 78. l. 29; the second at p. 83, l. 23; the third at the close of the eulogy of La Fayette, p. 89, l. 7; the fourth at p. 95, l. 33; the last in the conclusion of the speech. The general arrangement is in accordance with the usual principles of cause and effect, similarity and contrast, and contiguity.

(2) The second element that may enter into the body of a discourse is definition. When this term is used most people think only of the kind of definition that is found in the dictionaries, a single sentence giving the meaning of a term in other words that are likely to be better understood, a sentence that puts the thing to be defined into its proper genus or class and then gives its difference from the other members of the class. This kind of formal definition is almost always necessary in argumentative discourse, especially in debate. Before a proposition is discussed its terms must be understood.

But the word definition has a much wider meaning. It means all those processes of explanation, illustration, and example that set the limits of an idea. Lincoln's letter to Greeley is definitive of Lincoln's policy; it sets the limits of that policy and tells both what it includes and what it does not include. Definition may be inci-

dental and may appear in a discourse wherever it is needed, or it may be the main object of a discourse and may dictate the method of dealing with the whole subject. The general method involved in a definitive discourse is the method of inquiry or the inductive method.

(3) Narration, description, or exposition may also enter into a discourse. Each, like the element of definition, may be found on a very restricted scale, in one place in the discourse, or may be scattered through the discourse, appearing wherever it is needed; and, like the element of definition, each may be merely incidental or may dominate the whole discourse and determine its method. Older writers conceived of the narration as a separate and distinct part of the discourse, immediately following the exordium, or introduction, and immediately preceding the formal statement of the partition or division. They thought of it as a preliminary recital of facts or events which must be understood before proof and refutation could be profitably presented. When the facts or events were well known, the narration was to be omitted. The narration, when expressed, was to be persuasive; it was to foreshadow the proof and prepare the way for it, but was not to pretend to be proof itself. In modern public address we find this procedure still common and necessary in argumentative discourse, especially in debate; only here, in most cases, the narration would be more accurately called the description or the exposition, for it both recites facts and explains them. If the proposition refers to the past, some historical narrative will be unavoidable, early in the discussion. A present day proposition also may require preliminary narration, description, and exposition. Thus the proposition, "The present British ministry should be sustained in making

ANDERSON COLLEG

the taxation of land values a part of its 1909 budget," would certainly require a preliminary description of the economic conditions in England that make new sources of revenue necessary, a historical narrative showing what have been the customary sources of revenue in the past, a definition of the term "taxation of land values," and an exposition of certain principles of taxation. In the words of the older writers on rhetoric and oratory, *"The present state of the question must be made clear by narration and exposition."* The second paragraph of Webster's Bunker Hill oration performs a function analagous to that of the narration in an argumentative discourse; but in most expository addresses the narration is not concentrated in one part of the discourse. In sermons the place of the narration is supplied by the scripture reading that precedes. In sermons of the traditional type there was usually, in addition to this, an explanation of doctrine, definitive in character, just before the partition was announced.

What is a single feature of one address may be the entire substance of another: some addresses are essentially all narration, description, or exposition. The eulogy, for example, may be in its fundamental structure a narration. Superimposed upon this narration there will be a mass of description and exposition, the purpose of which is character interpretation. The biographical sketch preceding an appreciation of character is narration and description combined. If interpreted as standing in the relation of cause and effect to the work and influence of the life, it precisely fulfills the function of the narration in an argumentative discourse.* In most expository addresses, however, narration, description, definition, and explanation are

*See also p. 138.

scattered through the discourse. Thus in Webster's Bunker Hill address, the narrative is not all given in the second paragraph; after the first climax there are two pages of narrative (p. 78, l. 30—p. 80, l. 18) that furnish the basis of the address to the survivors. On p. 83, l. 24 begins another section of the narration covering more than three pages, leading up to the address to LaFayette. Indeed, after every one of Webster's climaxes the discourse is resumed on the narrative plane.

But the chief use of the narrative and descriptive parts of an expository address is to furnish the necessary amplification of the principal ideas of the discourse. Typical means of amplification are necessarily resorted to in every expository discourse. One of these is repetition of an idea in other words. This is especially necessary when the idea is not liked, or is somewhat difficult of apprehension, or, being essential, is to be made emphatic. Instances abound in Washington's Farewell Address. A case in point is the passage on page 43, lines 2 to 18. The idea of respect for the Federal Government is repeated in almost every sentence; and from line 19 to line 34, on page 43, the repetition is made by presenting the contrary of this idea, by dwelling upon the things that mean disrespect for the government.

Another of the means of amplification is enumeration. After declaring that every portion of our country has motives to guard the Union of the whole, Washington enumerates in one paragraph (p. 39, l. 30) the special motives that should act upon the North, the South, the East, and the West. A third means of amplification is the use of example. Washington refers (p. 42, ll. 9 to 20) to the treaty with Spain and to that with Eng-

land as examples of the nation-wide and non-sectional policy of the general government. The relative amount of amplification devoted to different ideas indicates their relative importance.

(4) A fourth element that may enter into the body of an address is proof and refutation. In an argumentative discourse it is naturally the chief element. But it may enter into a discourse of the expository type as an ancillary or subsidiary element. Thus in Washington's Farewell Address the section on "the baneful effects of the spirit of party" (p. 45, l. 6—p. 46, l. 23) is clearly argumentative. Party spirit should be repressed in a republic because (a) it means a revengeful despotism of the victorious faction over the defeated faction, (b) the despotism of factions alternately in power leads to intolerable disorders and miseries, (c) and these may incline men finally to seek security by setting up an individual despot, (d) even though it does not go so far as this, it enfeebles the public administration, (e) foments insurrection, and (f) opens the door to foreign interference. This also illustrates the kind of proof called the chain of reasoning from cause to effect.

Another kind of proof is the specific instance. The specific instances of disorder, insurrection, governmental embarrassment, foreign interference supported by domestic faction, were too recent to require mention: they were matters of common knowledge. The appeal to common knowledge or to universal exexperience is often offered in this way as a substitute for specific instances. One form of this appeal is the proverb and the maxim.

Instead of, or in addition to, the specific instances cited or the common knowledge appealed to, reference may be made to the testimony of individuals or to the

authority of books or of experts. It is usually necessary in employing this argument—the argument from authority—to show that the authority quoted is competent to speak to the point in issue, is disinterested and unprejudiced and entirely worthy of confidence. The argument derived from what we know of human nature, which Washington employs repeatedly in the Farewell Address, is a common form of the argument from cause to effect.

The order in which arguments shall be arranged must be determined anew for every address. Each address has its own logic, its own natural order, and the requirements of coherence are supreme. The advice is often given, not to place a weak argument first; but there is really no good place for a weak argument; a weak argument will not knowingly be used at all if a speaker discovers its weakness in time. The subject itself, the form of statement which the proposition takes, will always suggest some logical order for the argument, and this order will in general be the best and the most economical. But this order may be modified to meet the state of mind of the audience. It is well, for instance, to begin with an argument with which people are familiar; rather than with one that has been developed by research. It is well to begin with an argument that can be dealt with briefly, conclusively and simply, rather than with one that requires nicety of distinction and extended reasoning. It is well to close with the argument that the speaker himself values most. But all of these suggestions must give way in favor of logic and coherence.

The work of refutation is as important as the work of affirmation or direct proof. It consists not merely in replying to arguments that have actually been ad-

vanced, but also in considering unspoken objections that naturally suggest themselves. An argument is refuted either by disproving the fact on which it is based, or by disproving the inference that has been drawn from the fact. When the fact is admitted to be true and the inference drawn from it is true in part, and false in part, the refutation is effected by pointing out the distinction as Washington does (p. 46, ll. 9-23) in admitting the advantage of party spirit in a monarchy but denying its advantage in a republic. It does not follow *(non sequitur)*, he says, that because party spirit is useful in Europe, it should be encouraged in America.

3. The Conclusion. One purpose of the conclusion is to sum up in brief the whole matter that has been discussed. In an argumentative discourse the summary will often be bare and formal, recalling in order the points argued in the discussion. In an expository discourse the summary will not be made as an exact repetition, but will be presented with some variation and addition. Another purpose of the conclusion is to afford opportunity for a final appeal to the feelings. Here, if anywhere, the audience is prepared to receive such an appeal. The conclusion of Lincoln's First Inaugural (pp. 113-114) is highly persuasive partly on account of the introduction of the prophetic element and the element of faith in the supremacy of man's better impulses. An apt quotation often does this work most effectively. The conclusion should be brief and direct. It should be closely related in thought and spirit to the thought and spirit of the whole discourse.

FAREWELL ADDRESS

GEORGE WASHINGTON

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS—The period for a new election of a citizen, to administer the executive government of the United States, being not far distant, and the time actually arrived, when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprize you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation, which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service, which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in, the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped, that it would have

been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives, which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement, from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice, that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty, or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that, in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions, with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say, that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself, and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied, that, if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services, they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe, that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment, which is intended to terminate the career of my public life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude, which I owe to my beloved country for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead, amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging, in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that Heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence; that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual, that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained, that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete, by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation, which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments, which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all-important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government, which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty, which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee, that, from different causes and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial,

habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion, that it can in any event be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens, by birth or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest. Here every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry. The

South, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the agency of the North, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the North, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and, while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The East, in a like intercourse with the West, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find, a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The West derives from the East supplies requisite to its growth and comfort, and, what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the West can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connexion with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While, then, every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same

governments, which their own rivalships alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues would stimulate and embitter. Hence, likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the Union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope, that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those, who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations, Northern and Southern, Atlantic and Western; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expe-

dients of party to acquire influence, within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart-burnings, which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those, who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the Executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the Senate, of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at that event, throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the General Government and in the Atlantic States unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi; they have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain, and that with Spain, which secure to them every thing they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the Union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a Government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions, which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a Constitution of Government better calculated than your former for an intimate Union, and for

the efficacious management of your common concerns. This Government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true Liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish Government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established Government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency. They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force; to put, in the place of the delegated will of the nation, the will of a party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill-concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common counsels, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations, which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard, by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change, from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that, for the efficient management of your common interests, in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine

each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular reference to the founding of them on geographical discriminations. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party, generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but, in those of the popular form, it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight), the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the

community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another, foments occasionally riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which find a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion, that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And, there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest, instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution, in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the

truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for, though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit, which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national

morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who, that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is, to use it as sparingly as possible; avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertion in time of peace to discharge the debts, which unavoidable wars may have occasioned not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment, inseparable from the selection of the proper objects (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid con-

struction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be, that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt, that in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages, which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential, than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent col-

lisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill-will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained; and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation), facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding, with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly

enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defence against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connexion as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her

politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality, we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are

recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing, with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that, by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion, which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course, which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But, if I may even flatter myself, that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriot-

ism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index of my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your Representatives in both Houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest to take, a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it, with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe, that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that con-

duct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency, which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though, in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope, that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man, who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow-citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government, the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

United States, September 17th, 1796.

THE CHARACTER OF WASHINGTON

DANIEL WEBSTER

A speech delivered at a public dinner in the City of Washington, February 22, 1832, the centennial anniversary of Washington's birth.

We are met to testify our regard for him whose name is intimately blended with whatever belongs most essentially to the prosperity, the liberty, the free institutions, and the renown of our country. That name was of power to rally a nation, in the hour of thick-thronging public disasters and calamities; that name shone, amid the storm of war, a beacon light, to cheer and guide the country's friends; it flamed, too, like a meteor, to repel her foes. That name, in the days of peace, was a loadstone, attracting to itself a whole people's confidence, a whole people's love, and the whole world's respect. That name, descending with all time, spreading over the whole earth, and uttered in all the languages belonging to the tribes and races of men, will forever be pronounced with affectionate gratitude by every one in whose breast there shall arise an aspiration for human rights and human liberty.

We perform this grateful duty, Gentlemen, at the expiration of a hundred years from his birth, near the place, so cherished and beloved by him, where his dust now reposes, and in the capital which bears his own immortal name.

All experience evinces that human sentiments are strongly influenced by associations. The recurrence of

anniversaries, or of longer periods of time, naturally freshens the recollection, and deepens the impression, of events with which they are historically connected. Renowned places, also, have a power to awaken feeling, which all acknowledge. No American can pass by the fields of Bunker Hill, Monmouth, and Camden, as if they were ordinary spots on the earth's surface. Whoever visits them feels the sentiment of love of country kindling anew, as if the spirit that belonged to the transactions which have rendered these places distinguished still hovered round, with power to move and excite all who in future time may approach them.

But neither of these sources of emotion equals the power with which great moral examples affect the mind. When sublime virtues cease to be abstractions, when they become embodied in human character, and exemplified in human conduct, we should be false to our own nature if we did not indulge in the spontaneous effusions of our gratitude and our admiration. A true lover of the virtue of patriotism delights to contemplate its purest models; and that love of country may be well suspected which affects to soar so high into the regions of sentiment as to be lost and absorbed in the abstract feeling, and becomes too elevated or too refined to glow with fervor in the commendation or the love of individual benefactors. All this is unnatural. It is as if one should be so enthusiastic a lover of poetry as to care nothing for Homer or Milton; so passionately attached to eloquence as to be indifferent to Tully and Chatham; or such a devotee to the arts, in such an ecstasy with the elements of beauty, proportion, and expression, as to regard the masterpieces of Raphael and Michael Angelo with coldness or contempt. We may be assured, Gentlemen, that he who really loves the thing itself,

loves its finest exhibitions. A true friend of his country loves her friends and benefactors, and thinks it no degradation to commend and commemorate them. The voluntary outpouring of the public feeling, made to-day, from the north to the south, and from the east to the west, proves this sentiment to be both just and natural. In the cities and in the villages, in the public temples and in the family circles, among all ages and sexes, gladdened voices to-day bespeak grateful hearts and a freshened recollection of the virtues of the Father of his Country. And it will be so, in all time to come, so long as public virtue is itself an object of regard. The ingenuous youth of America will hold up to themselves the bright model of Washington's example, and study to be what they behold; they will contemplate his character till all its virtues spread out and display themselves to their delighted vision; as the earliest astronomers, the shepherds on the plains of Babylon, gazed at the stars till they saw them form into clusters and constellations, overpowering at length the eyes of the beholders with the united blaze of a thousand lights.

Gentlemen, we are at a point of a century from the birth of Washington; and what a century it has been! During its course, the human mind has seemed to proceed with a sort of geometric velocity, accomplishing for human intelligence and human freedom more than had been done in fives or tens of centuries preceding. Washington stands at the commencement of a new era, as well as at the head of the New World. A century from the birth of Washington has changed the world. The country of Washington has been the theatre on which a great part of that change has been wrought, and Washington himself a principal agent by which it has been

accomplished. His age and his country are equally full of wonders; and of both he is the chief.

If the poetical prediction, uttered a few years before his birth, be true; if indeed it be designed by Providence that the grandest exhibition of human character and human affairs shall be made on this theatre of the Western world; if it be true that,

> "The four first acts already past;
> A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
> Time's noblest offspring is the last";

how could this imposing, swelling, final scene be appropriately opened, how could its intense interest be adequately sustained, but by the introduction of just such a character as our Washington?

Washington had attained his manhood when that spark of liberty was struck out in his own country which has since kindled into a flame and shot its beams over the earth. In the flow of a century from his birth, the world has changed in science, in arts, in the extent of commerce, in the improvement of navigation, and in all that relates to the civilization of man. But it is the spirit of human freedom, the new elevation of individual man, in his moral, social, and political character, leading the whole long train of other improvements, which has most remarkably distinguished the era. Society, in this century, has not made its progress, like Chinese skill, by a greater acuteness of ingenuity in trifles; it has not merely lashed itself to an increased speed round the old circles of thought and action; but it has assumed a new character; it has raised itself from *beneath* governments to a participation *in* governments; it has mixed moral and political objects with the daily pursuits of individual men; and, with a freedom and

strength before altogether unknown, it has applied to these objects the whole power of the human understanding. It has been the era, in short, when the social principle has triumphed over the feudal principle; when society has maintained its rights against military power, and established, on foundations never hereafter to be shaken, its competency to govern itself.

It was the extraordinary fortune of Washington, that, having been intrusted, in revolutionary times, with the supreme military command, and having fulfilled that trust with equal renown for wisdom and for valor, he should be placed at the head of the first government in which an attempt was to be made on a large scale to rear the fabric of social order on the basis of a written constitution and of a pure representative principle. A government was to be established, without a throne, without an aristocracy, without castes, orders, or privileges; and this government, instead of being a democracy existing and acting within the walls of a single city, was to be extended over a vast country of different climates, interests, and habits, and of various communions of our common Christian faith. The experiment certainly was entirely new. A popular government of this extent, it was evident, could be framed only by carrying into full effect the principle of representation or of delegated power; and the world was to see whether society could, by the strength of this principle, maintain its own peace and good government, carry forward its own great interests, and conduct itself to political renown and glory. By the benignity of Providence, this experiment, so full of interest to us and to our posterity forever, so full of interest, indeed, to the world in its present generation and in all its generations to come, was suffered to commence under the guidance of Wash-

ington. Destined for this high career, he was fitted for it by wisdom, by virtue, by patriotism, by discretion, by whatever can inspire confidence in man toward man. In entering on the untried scenes, early disappointment and the premature extinction of all hope of success would have been certain, had it not been that there did exist throughout the country, in a most extraordinary degree, an unwavering trust in him who stood at the helm.

I remarked, Gentlemen, that the whole world was and is interested in the result of this experiment. And is it not so? Do we deceive ourselves, or is it true that at this moment the career which this government is running is among the most attractive objects to the civilized world? Do we deceive ourselves, or is it true that at this moment that love of liberty and that understanding of its true principles which are flying over the whole earth, as on the wings of all the winds, are really and truly of American origin?

At the period of the birth of Washington there existed in Europe no political liberty in large communities, except in the provinces of Holland, and except that England herself had set a great example, so far as it went, by her glorious Revolution of 1688. Everywhere else, despotic power was predominant, and the feudal or military principle held the mass of mankind in hopeless bondage. One-half of Europe was crushed beneath the Bourbon sceptre, and no conception of political liberty, no hope even of religious toleration, existed among that nation which was America's first ally. The king was the state, the king was the country, the king was all. There was one king, with power not derived from his people, and too high to be questioned; and the rest were all subjects, with no political right but obedience. All

above was intangible power, all below quiet subjection. A recent occurrence in the French chamber shows us how public opinion on these subjects is changed. A minister had spoken of the "king's subjects." "There are no subjects," exclaimed hundreds of voices at once, "in a country where the people make the king!"

Gentlemen, the spirit of human liberty and of free government, nurtured and grown into strength and beauty in America, has stretched its course into the midst of the nations. Like an emanation from Heaven, it has gone forth, and it will not return void. It must change, it is fast changing, the face of the earth. Our great, our high duty is to show, in our own example, that this spirit is a spirit of health as well as a spirit of power; that its benignity is as great as its strength; that its efficiency to secure individual rights, social relations, and moral order, is equal to the irresistible force with which it prostrates principalities and powers. The world, at this moment, is regarding us with a willing but something of a fearful admiration. Its deep and awful anxiety is to learn whether free States may be stable, as well as free; whether popular power may be trusted, as well as feared; in short, whether wise, regular, and virtuous self-government is a vision for the contemplation of theorists, or a truth established, illustrated, and brought into practice in the country of Washington.

Gentlemen, for the earth which we inhabit, and the whole circle of the sun, for all the unborn races of mankind, we seem to hold in our hands, for their weal or woe, the fate of this experiment. If we fail, who shall venture the repetition? If our example shall prove to be one not of encouragement, but of terror, not fit to be imitated, but fit only to be shunned, where else shall

the world look for free models? If this great *Western Sun* be struck out of the firmament, at what other fountain shall the lamp of liberty hereafter be lighted? What other orb shall emit a ray to glimmer, even, on the darkness of the world?

There is no danger of our overrating or overstating the important part which we are now acting in human affairs. It should not flatter our personal self-respect, but it should reanimate our patriotic virtues, and inspire us with a deeper and more solemn sense both of our privileges and of our duties We cannot wish better for our country, nor for the world, than that the same spirit which influenced Washington may influence all who succeed him; and that the same blessing from above, which attended his efforts, may also attend theirs.

The principles of Washington's administration are not left doubtful. They are to be found in the Constitution itself, in the great measures recommended and approved by him, in his speeches to Congress, and in that most interesting paper, his Farewell Address to the people of the United States. The success of the government under his administration is the highest proof of the soundness of these principles. And, after an experience of thirty-five years, what is there which an enemy could condemn? What is there which either his friends, or the friends of the country, could wish to have been otherwise? I speak, of course, of great measures and leading principles.

In the first place, all his measures were right in their intent. He stated the whole basis of his own great character, when he told the country, in the homely phrase of the proverb, that honesty is the best policy. One of the most striking things ever said of him is, that *"he changed mankind's ideas of political greatness."*

To commanding talents, and to success, the common elements of such greatness, he added a disregard of self, a spotlessness of motive, a steady submission to every public and private duty, which threw far into the shade the whole crowd of vulgar great. The object of his regard was the whole country. No part of it was enough to fill his enlarged patriotism. His love of glory, so far as that may be supposed to have influenced him at all, spurned everything short of general approbation. It would have been nothing to him that his partisans or his favorites outnumbered, or outvoted, or outmanaged, or outclamored, those of other leaders. He had no favorites; he rejected all partisanship; and, acting honestly for the universal good, he deserved, what he has so richly enjoyed, the universal love.

His principle it was to act right, and to trust the people for support; his principle it was not to follow the lead of sinister and selfish ends, nor to rely on the little arts of party delusion to obtain public sanction for such a course. Born for his country and for the world, he did not give up to party what was meant for mankind. The consequence is, that his fame is as durable as his principles, as lasting as truth and virtue themselves. While the hundreds whom party excitement, and temporary circumstances, and casual combinations, have raised into transient notoriety, sink again, like thin bubbles, bursting and dissolving into the great ocean, Washington's fame is like the rock which bounds that ocean, and at whose feet its billows are destined to break harmlessly forever.

The maxims upon which Washington conducted our foreign relations were few and simple. The first was an entire and indisputable impartiality towards foreign States. He adhered to this rule of public conduct,

against very strong inducements to depart from it, and when the popularity of the moment seemed to favor such a departure. In the next place, he maintained true dignity and unsullied honor in all communications with foreign States. It was among the high duties devolved upon him to introduce our new government into the circle of civilized States and powerful nations. Not arrogant or assuming, with no unbecoming or supercilious bearing, he yet exacted for it from all others entire and punctilious respect. He demanded, and he obtained at once, a standing of perfect equality for his country in the society of nations; nor was there a prince or potentate of his day, whose personal character carried with it, into the intercourse of other States, a greater degree of respect and veneration.

He regarded other nations only as they stood in political relations to us. With their internal affairs, their political parties and dissensions, he scrupulously abstained from all interference; and, on the other hand, he repelled with spirit all such interference by others with us or our concerns. His sternest rebuke, the most indignant measure of his whole administration, was aimed against such an attempted interference. He felt it as an attempt to wound the national honor, and resented it accordingly.

The reiterated admonitions in his Farewell Address show his deep fears that foreign influence would insinuate itself into our counsels through the channels of domestic dissension, and obtain a sympathy with our own temporary parties. Against all such dangers he most earnestly entreats the country to guard itself. He appeals to its patriotism, to its self-respect, to its own honor, to every consideration connected with its welfare and happiness, to resist, at the very beginning, all ten-

dencies towards such connection of foreign interests with our own affairs. With a tone of earnestness nowhere else found, even in his last affectionate farewell advice to his countrymen, he says, "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

Lastly, on the subject of foreign relations, Washington never forgot that we had interests peculiar to ourselves. The primary political concerns of Europe, he saw, did not affect us. We had nothing to do with her balance of power, her family compacts, or her successions to thrones. We were placed in a condition favorable to neutrality during European wars, and to the enjoyment of all the great advantages of that relation. "Why, then," he asks us, "why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?"

Indeed, Gentlemen, Washington's Farewell Address is full of truths important at all times, and particularly deserving consideration at the present. With a sagacity which brought the future before him, and made it like the present, he saw and pointed out the dangers that even at this moment most imminently threaten us. I hardly know how a greater service of that kind could now be done to the community, than by a renewed and wide diffusion of that admirable paper, and an earnest invitation to every man in the country to peruse and consider it. Its political maxims are invaluable; its

exhortations to love of country and to brotherly affection among citizens, touching; and the solemnity with which it urges the observance of moral duties, and impresses the power of religious obligation, gives to it the highest character of truly disinterested, sincere, parental advice.

The domestic policy of Washington found its pole-star in the avowed objects of the Constitution itself. He sought so to administer that Constitution as to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty. These were objects interesting, in the highest degree, to the whole country, and his policy embraced the whole country.

Among his earliest and most important duties was the organization of the government itself, the choice of his confidential advisers, and the various appointments to office. This duty, so important and delicate, when a whole government was to be organized, and all its offices for the first time filled, was yet not difficult to him, for he had no sinister ends to accomplish, no clamorous partisans to gratify, no pledges to redeem, no object to be regarded but simply the public good. It was a plain, straightforward matter, a mere honest choice of good men for the public service.

His own singleness of purpose, his disinterested patriotism, were evinced by the selection of his first cabinet, and by the manner in which he filled the seats of justice, and other places of high trust. He sought for men fit for offices; not for offices which might suit men. Above personal considerations, above local considerations, above party considerations, he felt that he could only discharge the sacred trust which the country had placed in

his hands, by a diligent inquiry after real merit, and a conscientious preference of virtue and talent. The whole country was the field of his selection. He explored that whole field, looking only for whatever it contained most worthy and distinguished. He was, indeed, most successful, and he deserved success for the purity of his motives, the liberality of his sentiments, and his enlarged and manly policy.

Washington's administration established the national credit, made provision for the public debt, and for that patriotic army whose interests and welfare were always so dear to him; and, by laws wisely framed, and of admirable effect, raised the commerce and navigation of the country, almost at once, from depression and ruin to a state of prosperity. Nor were his eyes open to these interests alone. He viewed with equal concern its agriculture and manufactures, and, so far as they came within the regular exercise of the powers of this government, they experienced regard and favor.

It should not be omitted, even in this slight reference to the general measures and general principles of the first President, that he saw and felt the full value and importance of the judicial department of the government. An upright and able administration of the laws he held to be alike indispensable to private happiness and public liberty. The temple of justice, in his opinion, was a sacred place, and he would profane and pollute it who should call any to minister in it, not spotless in character, not incorruptible in integrity, not competent by talent and learning, not a fit object of unhesitating trust.

Among other admonitions, Washington has left us, in his last communication to his country, an exhortation against the excesses of party spirit. A fire not to be

quenched, he yet conjures us not to fan and feed the flame. Undoubtedly, Gentlemen, it is the greatest danger of our system and of our time. Undoubtedly, if that system should be overthrown, it will be the work of excessive party spirit, acting on the government, which is dangerous enough, or acting *in* the government, which is a thousand times more dangerous; for government then becomes nothing but organized party, and, in the strange vicissitudes of human affairs, it may come at last, perhaps, to exhibit the singular paradox of government itself being in opposition to its own powers, at war with the very elements of its own existence. Such cases are hopeless. As men may be protected against murder, but cannot be guarded against suicide, so government may be shielded from the assaults of external foes, but nothing can save it when it chooses to lay violent hands on itself.

Finally, Gentlemen, there was in the breast of Washington one sentiment so deeply felt, so constantly uppermost, that no proper occasion escaped without its utterance. From the letter which he signed in behalf of the Convention when the Constitution was sent out to the people, to the moment when he put his hand to that last paper in which he addressed his countrymen, the Union, —the Union was the great object of his thoughts. In that first letter he tells them that to him and his brethren of the Convention, union appears to be the greatest interest of every true American; and in that last paper he conjures them to regard that unity of government which constitutes them one people as the very palladium of their prosperity and safety, and the security of liberty itself. He regarded the union of these States less as one of our blessings, than as the great treasure-house which contained them all. Here, in his

judgment, was the great magazine of all our means of prosperity; here, as he thought, and as every true American still thinks, are deposited all our animating prospects, all our solid hopes for future greatness. He has taught us to maintain this union, not by seeking to enlarge the powers of the government, on the one hand, nor by surrendering them, on the other; but by an administration of them at once firm and moderate, pursuing objects truly national, and carried on in a spirit of justice and equity.

The extreme solicitude for the preservation of the Union, at all times manifested by him, shows not only the opinion he entertained of its importance, but his clear perception of those causes which were likely to spring up to endanger it, and which, if once they should overthrow the present system, would leave little hope of any future beneficial reunion. Of all the presumptions indulged by presumptuous man, that is one of the rashest which looks for repeated and favorable opportunities for the deliberate establishment of a united government over distinct and widely extended communities. Such a thing has happened once in human affairs, and but once; the event stands out as a prominent exception to all ordinary history; and unless we suppose ourselves running into an age of miracles, we may not expect its repetition.

Washington, therefore, could regard, and did regard, nothing as of paramount political interest but the integrity of the Union itself. With a united government, well administered, he saw that we had nothing to fear; and without it, nothing to hope. The sentiment is just, and its momentous truth should solemnly impress the whole country. If we might regard our country as personated in the spirit of Washington, if we might con-

sider him as representing her, in her past renown, her present prosperity, and her future career, and as in that character demanding of us all to account for our conduct, as political men or as private citizens, how should he answer him who has ventured to talk of disunion and dismemberment? Or how should he answer him who dwells perpetually on local interests, and fans every kindling flame of local prejudice? How should he answer him who would array State against State, interest against interest, and party against party, careless of the continuance of that unity of government which constitutes us one people?

The political prosperity which this country has attained, and which it now enjoys, has been acquired mainly through the instrumentality of the present government. While this agent continues, the capacity of attaining to still higher degrees of prosperity exists also. We have, while this lasts, a political life capable of beneficial exertion, with power to resist or overcome misfortunes, to sustain us against the ordinary accidents of human affairs, and to promote, by active efforts, every public interest. But dismemberment strikes at the very being which preserves these faculties. It would lay its rude and ruthless hand on this great agent itself. It would sweep away, not only what we possess, but all power of regaining lost, or acquiring new possessions. It would leave the country not only bereft of its prosperity and happiness, but without limbs, or organs, or faculties, by which to exert itself hereafter in the pursuit of that prosperity and happiness.

Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it;

if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skilful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

But let us hope for betters things. Let us trust in that gracious Being who had hitherto held our country as in the hollow of his hand. Let us trust to the virtue and the intelligence of the people, and to the efficacy of religious obligation. Let us trust to the influence of Washington's example. Let us hope that that fear of Heaven which expels all other fear, and that regard to duty which transcends all other regard, may influence public men and private citizens, and lead our country still onward in her happy career. Full of these gratifying anticipations and hopes, let us look forward to the end of that century which is now commenced. A hundred years hence, other disciples of Washington will celebrate his birth, with no less of sincere admiration than we now commemorate it. When they shall meet,

as we now meet, to do themselves and him that honor, so surely as they shall see the blue summits of his native mountains rise in the horizon, so surely as they shall behold the river on whose banks he lived, and on whose banks he rests, still flowing on toward the sea, so surely may they see, as we now see, the flag of the Union floating on the top of the Capitol; and then, as now, may the sun in his course visit no land more free, more happy, more lovely, than this our own country!

THE BUNKER HILL MONUMENT

DANIEL WEBSTER

An address delivered at the laying of the corner-stone at Charlestown, Massachusetts, June 17, 1825.

This uncounted multitude before me and around me proves the feeling which the occasion has excited. These thousands of human faces, glowing with sympathy and joy, and from the impulses of a common gratitude turned reverently to heaven in this spacious temple of the firmament, proclaim that the day, the place, and the purpose of our assembling have made a deep impression on our hearts.

If, indeed, there be anything in local association fit to affect the mind of man, we need not strive to repress the emotions which agitate us here. We are among the sepulchres of our fathers. We are on ground distinguished by their valor, their constancy, and the shedding of their blood. We are here, not to fix an uncertain date in our annals, nor to draw into notice an obscure and unknown spot. If our humble purpose had never been conceived, if we ourselves had never been born, the 17th of June, 1775, would have been a day on which all subsequent history would have poured its light, and the eminence where we stand a point of attraction to the eyes of successive generations. But we are Americans. We live in what may be called the early age of this great continent; and we know that our posterity, through all time, are here to enjoy and suffer the allotments of humanity. We see before us a probable train

of great events; we know that our own fortunes have been happily cast; and it is natural, therefore, that we should be moved by the contemplation of occurrences which have guided our destiny before many of us were born, and settled the condition in which we should pass that portion of our existence which God allows to men on earth.

We do not read even of the discovery of this continent, without feeling something of a personal interest in the event; without being reminded how much it has affected our own fortunes and our own existence. It would be still more unnatural for us, therefore, than for others, to contemplate with unaffected minds that interesting, I may say that most touching and pathetic scene, when the great discoverer of America stood on the deck of his shattered bark, the shades of night falling on the sea, yet no man sleeping; tossed on the billows of an unknown ocean, yet the stronger billows of alternate hope and despair tossing his own troubled thoughts; extending forward his harassed frame, straining westward his anxious and eager eyes, till Heaven at last granted him a moment of rapture and ecstasy, in blessing his vision with the sight of the unknown world.

Nearer to our times, more closely connected with our fates, and therefore still more interesting to our feelings and affections, is the settlement of our own country by colonists from England. We cherish every memorial of these worthy ancestors; we celebrate their patience and fortitude; we admire their daring enterprise; we teach our children to venerate their piety; and we are justly proud of being descended from men who have set the world an example of founding civil institutions on the great and united principles of human freedom and human knowledge. To us, their children, the story of

their labors and sufferings can never be without its interest. We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it; nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment, till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended.

But the great event in the history of the continent, which we are now met here to commemorate, that prodigy of modern times, at once the wonder and the blessing of the world, is the American Revolution. In a day of extraordinary prosperity and happiness, of high national honor, distinction, and power, we are brought together, in this place, by our love of country, by our admiration of exalted character, by our gratitude for signal services and patriotic devotion.

The Society whose organ I am was formed for the purpose of rearing some honorable and durable monument to the memory of the early friends of American Independence. They have thought that for this object no time could be more propitious than the present prosperous and peaceful period, that no place could claim preference over this memorable spot, and that no day could be more auspicious to the undertaking than the anniversary of the battle which was here fought. The foundation of that monument we have now laid. With solemnities suited to the occasion, with prayers to Almighty God for his blessing, and in the midst of this cloud of witnesses, we have begun the work. We trust it will be prosecuted, and that, springing from a broad foundation, rising high in massive solidity and unadorned grandeur, it may remain as long as Heaven permits the works of man to last, a fit emblem, both of the

events in memory of which it is raised, and of the gratitude of those who have reared it.

We know, indeed, that the record of illustrious actions is most safely deposited in the universal remembrance of mankind. We know that if we could cause this structure to ascend, not only till it reached the skies, but till it pierced them, its broad surfaces could still contain but part of that which, in an age of knowledge, hath already been spread over the earth, and which history charges itself with making known to all future times. We know that no inscription on entablatures less broad than the earth itself can carry information of the events we commemorate where it has not already gone; and that no structure which shall not outlive the duration of letters and knowledge among men can prolong the memorial. But our object is, by this edifice, to show our own deep sense of the value and importance of the achievements of our ancestors; and, by presenting this work of gratitude to the eye, to keep alive similar sentiments, and to foster a constant regard for the principles of the Revolution. Human beings are composed, not of reason only, but of imagination also, and sentiment; and that is neither wasted nor misapplied which is appropriated to the purpose of giving right direction to sentiments, and opening proper springs of feeling in the heart.

Let it not be supposed that our object is to perpetuate national hostility, or even to cherish a mere military spirit. It is higher, purer, nobler. We consecrate our work to the spirit of national independence, and we wish that the light of peace may rest upon it forever. We rear a memorial of our conviction of that unmeasured benefit which has been conferred on our own land, and of the happy influences which have been

produced, by the same events, on the general interests of mankind. We come, as Americans, to mark a spot which must forever be dear to us and our posterity. We wish that whosoever, in all coming time, shall turn his eye hither, may behold that the place is not undistinguished where the first great battle of the Revolution was fought. We wish that this structure may proclaim the magnitude and importance of that event to every class and every age. We wish that infancy may learn the purpose of its erection from maternal lips, and that weary and withered age may behold it, and be solaced by the recollections which it suggests. We wish that labor may look up here, and be proud in the midst of its toil. We wish that, in those days of disaster which, as they come upon all nations, must be expected to come upon us also, desponding patriotism may turn its eyes hitherward, and be assured that the foundations of our national power are still strong. We wish that this column, rising towards heaven among the pointed spires of so many temples dedicated to God, may contribute also to produce, in all minds, a pious feeling of dependence and gratitude. We wish, finally, that the last object to the sight of him who leaves his native shore, and the first to gladden his who revisits it, may be something which shall remind him of the liberty and the glory of his country. Let it rise! let it rise, till it meet the sun in his coming; let the earliest light of the morning gild it, and parting day linger and play on its summit.

We live in a most extraordinary age. Events so various and so important that they might crowd and distinguish centuries are, in our times, compressed within the compass of a single life. When has it happened that history has had so much to record, in

the same term of years, as since the 17th of June, 1775? Our own revolution, which, under other circumstances, might itself have been expected to occasion a war of half a century, has been achieved; twenty-four sovereign and independent States erected; and a general government established over them, so safe, so wise, so free, so practical, that we might well wonder its establishment should have been accomplished so soon, were it not far the greater wonder that it should have been established at all. Two or three millions of people have been augmented to twelve, the great forests of the West prostrated beneath the arm of successful industry, and the dwellers on the banks of the Ohio and the Mississippi become the fellow-citizens and neighbors of those who cultivate the hills of New England. We have a commerce that leaves no sea unexplored; navies which take no law from superior force; revenues adequate to all the exigencies of government, almost without taxation; and peace with all nations, founded on equal rights and mutual respect.

Europe, within the same period, has been agitated by a mighty revolution, which, while it has been felt in the individual condition and happiness of almost every man, has shaken to the centre her political fabric, and dashed against one another thrones which had stood tranquil for ages. On this, our continent, our own example has been followed, and colonies have sprung up to be nations. Unaccustomed sounds of liberty and free government have reached us from beyond the track of the sun; and at this moment the dominion of European power in this continent, from the place where we stand to the south pole, is annihilated for ever.

In the mean time, both in Europe and America, such has been the general progress of knowledge, such the improvement in legislation, in commerce, in the arts, in letters, and, above all, in liberal ideas and the general spirit of the age, that the whole world seems changed.

Yet, notwithstanding that this is but a faint abstract of the things which have happened since the day of the battle of Bunker Hill, we are but fifty years removed from it; and we now stand here to enjoy all the blessings of our own condition, and to look abroad on the brightened prospects of the world, while we still have among us some of those who were active agents in the scenes of 1775, and who are now here, from every quarter of New England, to visit once more, and under circumstances so affecting, I had almost said so overwhelming, this renowned theatre of their courage and patriotism.

Venerable men! you have come down to us from a former generation. Heaven has bounteously lengthened out your lives, that you might behold this joyous day. You are now where you stood fifty years ago, this very hour, with your brothers, and your neighbors, shoulder to shoulder, in the strife for your country. Behold, how altered! The same heavens are indeed over your heads; the same ocean rolls at your feet; but all else how changed! You hear now no roar of hostile cannon, you see no mixed volumes of smoke and flame rising from burning Charlestown. The ground strewed with the dead and dying; the impetuous charge; the steady and successful repulse; the loud call to repeated assault; the summoning of all that is manly to repeated resistance; a thousand bosoms freely and fearlessly bared in an instant to whatever of terror there may be

in war and death,—all these you have witnessed, but you witness them no more. All is peace. The heights of yonder metropolis, its towers and roofs, which you then saw filled with wives and children and countrymen in distress and terror, and looking with unutterable emotions for the issue of the combat, have presented you to-day with the sight of its whole happy population come out to welcome and greet you with a universal jubilee. Yonder proud ships, by a felicity of position appropriately lying at the foot of this mount, and seeming fondly to cling around it, are not means of annoyance to you, but your country's own means of distinction and defence. All is peace; and God has granted you this sight of your country's happiness, ere you slumber in the grave. He has allowed you to behold and to partake the reward of your patriotic toils; and he has allowed us, your sons and countrymen, to meet you here, and in the name of the present generation, in the name of your country, in the name of liberty, to thank you!

But, alas! you are not all here! Time and the sword have thinned your ranks. Prescott, Putnam, Stark, Brooks, Read, Pomeroy, Bridge! our eyes seek for you in vain amid this broken band. You are gathered to your fathers, and live only to your country in her grateful remembrance and your own bright example. But let us not too much grieve that you have met the common fate of men. You lived at least long enough to know that your work had been nobly and successfully accomplished. You lived to see your country's independence established, and to sheathe your swords from war. On the light of Liberty you saw arise the light of Peace, like

> "another morn,
> Risen on mid-noon;"

and the sky on which you closed your eyes was cloudless.

But ah! Him! the first great martyr in this great cause! Him! the premature victim of his own self-devoting heart! Him! the head of our civil councils, and the destined leader of our military bands, whom nothing brought hither but the unquenchable fire of his own spirit! Him! cut off by Providence in the hour of overwhelming anxiety and thick gloom; falling ere he saw the star of his country rise; pouring out his generous blood like water, before he knew whether it would fertilize a land of freedom or of bondage!—how shall I struggle with the emotions that stifle the utterance of thy name! Our poor work may perish; but thine shall endure! This monument may moulder away; the solid ground it rests upon may sink down to a level with the sea; but thy memory shall not fail! Wheresoever among men a heart shall be found that beats to the transports of patriotism and liberty, its aspirations shall be claimed kindred with thy spirit!

But the scene amidst which we stand does not permit us to confine our thoughts or our sympathies to those fearless spirits who hazarded or lost their lives on this consecrated spot. We have the happiness to rejoice here in the presence of a most worthy representation of the survivors of the whole Revolutionary army.

Veterans! you are the remnant of many a well-fought field. You bring with you marks of honor from Trenton and Monmouth, from Yorktown, Camden, Bennington, and Saratoga. Veterans of half a century! when in your youthful days you put everything at hazard in your country's cause, good as that cause was, and sanguine as youth is, still your fondest hopes did not stretch onward to an hour like this! At a period to which you could not reasonably have expected to arrive,

at a moment of national prosperity such as you could never have foreseen, you are now met here to enjoy the fellowship of old soldiers, and to receive the overflowings of a universal gratitude.

But your agitated countenances and your heaving breasts inform me that even this is not an unmixed joy. I perceive that a tumult of contending feelings rushes upon you. The images of the dead, as well as the persons of the living, present themselves before you. The scene overwhelms you, and I turn from it. May the Father of all mercies smile upon your declining years, and bless them! And when you shall here have exchanged your embraces, when you shall once more have pressed the hands which have been so often extended to give succor in adversity, or grasped in the exultation of victory, then look abroad upon this lovely land which your young valor defended, and mark the happiness with which it is filled; yea, look abroad upon the whole earth, and see what a name you have contributed to give to your country, and what praise you have added to freedom, and then rejoice in the sympathy and gratitude which beam upon your last days from the improved condition of mankind!

The occasion does not require of me any particular account of the battle of the 17th of June, 1775, nor any detailed narrative of the events which immediately preceded it. These are familiarly known to all. In the progress of the great and interesting controversy, Massachusetts and the town of Boston had become early and marked objects of the displeasure of the British Parliament. This had been manifested in the act for altering the government of the Province, and in that for shutting up the port of Boston. Nothing sheds more honor on our early history, and

nothing better shows how little the feelings and sentiments of the Colonies were known or regarded in England, than the impression which these measures everywhere produced in America. It had been anticipated, that while the Colonies in general would be terrified by the severity of the punishment inflicted on Massachusetts, the other seaports would be governed by a mere spirit of gain; and that, as Boston was now cut off from all commerce, the unexpected advantage which this blow on her was calculated to confer on other towns would be greedily enjoyed. How miserably such reasoners deceived themselves! How little they knew of the depth, and the strength, and the intenseness of that feeling of resistance to illegal acts of power, which possessed the whole American people. Everywhere the unworthy boon was rejected with scorn. The fortunate occasion was seized, everywhere, to show to the whole world that the Colonies were swayed by no local interest, no partial interest, no selfish interest. The temptation to profit by the punishment of Boston was strongest to our neighbors of Salem. Yet Salem was precisely the place where this miserable proffer was spurned, in a tone of the most lofty self-respect and the most indignant patriotism. "We are deeply affected," said its inhabitants, "with the sense of our public calamities; but the miseries that are now rapidly hastening on our brethren in the capital of the Province greatly excite our commiseration. By shutting up the port of Boston some imagine that the course of trade might be turned hither and to our benefit; but we must be dead to every idea of justice, lost to all feelings of humanity, could we indulge a thought to seize on wealth and raise our fortunes on the ruin of our

suffering neighbors." These noble sentiments were not confined to our immediate vicinity. In that day of general affection and brotherhood, the blow given to Boston smote on every patriotic heart from one end of the country to the other. Virginia and the Carolinas, as well as Connecticut and New Hampshire, felt and proclaimed the cause to be their own. The Continental Congress, then holding its first session in Philadelphia, expressed its sympathy for the suffering inhabitants of Boston, and addresses were received from all quarters, assuring them that the cause was a common one, and should be met by common efforts and common sacrifices. The Congress of Massachusetts responded to these assurances; and in an address to the Congress at Philadelphia, bearing the official signature, perhaps among the last, of the immortal Warren, notwithstanding the severity of its suffering and the magnitude of the dangers which threatened it, it was declared that this Colony "is ready, at all times, to spend and to be spent in the cause of America."

But the hour drew nigh which was to put professions to the proof, and to determine whether the authors of these mutual pledges were ready to seal them in blood. The tidings of Lexington and Concord had no sooner spread, than it was universally felt that the time was at last come for action. A spirit pervaded all ranks, not transient, not boisterous, but deep, solemn, determined,—

"Totamque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet."

War on their own soil and at their own doors, was, indeed, a strange work to the yeomanry of New Eng-

land; but their consciences were convinced of its necessity, their country called them to it, and they did not withhold themselves from the perilous trial. The ordinary occupations of life were abandoned; the plough was stayed in the unfinished furrow; wives gave up their husbands, and mothers gave up their sons, to the battles of a civil war. Death might come in honor, on the field; it might come, in disgrace, on the scaffold. For either or for both they were prepared. The sentiment of Quincy was full in their hearts. "Blandishments," said that distinguished son of genius and patriotism, "will not fascinate us, nor will threats of a halter intimidate; for, under God, we are determined, that, whatsoever, whensoever, or howsoever, we shall be called to make our exit, we will die free men."

The 17th of June saw the four New England Colonies standing here side by side, to triumph or to fall together; and there was with them from that moment to the end of the war, what I hope will remain with them for ever,—one cause, one country, one heart.

The battle of Bunker Hill was attended with the most important effects beyond its immediate results as a military engagement. It created at once a state of open, public war. There could now be no longer a question of proceeding against individuals, as guilty of treason or rebellion. That fearful crisis was past. The appeal lay to the sword, and the only question was, whether the spirit and the resources of the people would hold out till the object should be accomplished. Nor were its general consequences confined to our own country. The previous proceedings of the Colonies, their appeals, resolutions, and addresses, had made their cause known to Europe. Without boasting, we

may say, that in no age or country has the public cause been maintained with more force of argument, more power of illustration, or more of that persuasion which excited feeling and elevated principle can alone bestow, than the Revolutionary state papers exhibit. These papers will forever deserve to be studied, not only for the spirit which they breathe, but for the ability with which they were written.

To this able vindication of their cause, the Colonies had now added a practical and severe proof of their own true devotion to it, and given evidence also of the power which they could bring to its support. All now saw, that if America fell, she would not fall without a struggle. Men felt sympathy and regard, as well as surprise, when they beheld these infant states, remote, unknown, unaided, encounter the power of England, and, in the first considerable battle, leave more of their enemies dead on the field, in proportion to the number of combatants, than had been recently known to fall in the wars of Europe.

Information of these events, circulating throughout the world, at length reached the ears of one who now hears me. He has not forgotten the emotion which the fame of Bunker Hill, and the name of Warren, excited in his youthful breast.

Sir, we are assembled to commemorate the establishment of great public principles of liberty, and to do honor to the distinguished dead. The occasion is too severe for eulogy of the living. But, Sir, your interesting relation to this country, the peculiar circumstances which surround you and surround us, call on me to express the happiness which we derive from your presence and aid in this solemn commemoration.

Fortunate, fortunate man! with what measure of de-

votion will you not thank God for the circumstances of your extraordinary life! You are connected with both hemispheres and with two generations. Heaven saw fit to ordain that the electric spark of liberty should be conducted, through you, from the New World to the Old; and we, who are now here to perform this duty of patriotism, have all of us long ago received it in charge from our fathers to cherish your name and your virtues. You will account it an instance of your good fortune, Sir, that you crossed the seas to visit us at a time which enables you to be present at this solemnity. You now behold the field, the renown of which reached you in the heart of France, and caused a thrill in your ardent bosom. You see the lines of the little redoubt thrown up by the incredible diligence of Prescott; defended, to the last extremity, by his lion-hearted valor; and within which the corner-stone of our monument has now taken its position. You see where Warren fell, and where Parker, Gardner, McCleary, Moore, and other early patriots, fell with him. Those who survived that day, and whose lives have been prolonged to the present hour, are now around you. Some of them you have known in the trying scenes of the war. Behold! they now stretch forth their feeble arms to embrace you. Behold! they raise their trembling voices to invoke the blessing of God on you and yours forever.

Sir, you have assisted us in laying the foundation of this structure. You have heard us rehearse, with our feeble commendation, the names of departed patriots. Monuments and eulogy belong to the dead. We give them this day to Warren and his associates. On other occasions they have been given to your more immediate companions in arms, to Washington, to Greene, to Gates,

to Sullivan, and to Lincoln. We have become reluctant to grant these, our highest and last honors, further. We would gladly hold them yet back from the little remnant of that immortal band. *Serus in cœlum redeas.* Illustrious as are your merits, yet far, oh, very far distant be the day when any inscription shall bear your name, or any tongue pronounce its eulogy!

The leading reflection to which this occasion seems to invite us respects the great changes which have happened in the fifty years since the battle of Bunker Hill was fought. And it peculiarly marks the character of the present age, that, in looking at these changes, and in estimating their effect on our condition, we are obliged to consider, not what has been done in our own country only, but in others also. In these interesting times, while nations are making separate and individual advances in improvement, they make, too, a common progress; like vessels on a common tide, propelled by the gales at different rates, according to their several structure and management, but all moved forward by one mighty current, strong enough to bear onward whatever does not sink beneath it.

A chief distinction of the present day is a community of opinions and knowledge amongst men in different nations, existing in a degree heretofore unknown. Knowledge has, in our time, triumphed, and is triumphing, over distance, over difference of languages, over diversity of habits, over prejudice, and over bigotry. The civilized and Christian world is fast learning the great lesson, that difference of nation does not imply necessary hostility, and that all contact need not be war. The whole world is becoming a common field for intellect to act in. Energy of mind, genius, power, wheresoever it exists, may speak out in any tongue, and the

world will hear it. A great chord of sentiment and feeling runs through two continents, and vibrates over both. Every breeze wafts intelligence from country to country; every wave rolls it; all give it forth, and all in turn receive it. There is a vast commerce of ideas; there are marts and exchanges for intellectual discoveries, and a wonderful fellowship of those individual intelligences which make up the mind and opinion of the age. Mind is the great lever of all things; human thought is the process by which human ends are ultimately answered; and the diffusion of knowledge, so astonishing in the last half-century, has rendered innumerable minds, variously gifted by nature, competent to be competitors or fellow-workers on the theatre of intellectual operation.

From these causes important improvements have taken place in the personal condition of individuals. Generally speaking, mankind are not only better fed and better clothed, but they are able also to enjoy more leisure; they possess more refinement and more self-respect. A superior tone of education, manners, and habits prevails. This remark, most true in its application to our own country, is also partly true when applied elsewhere. It is proved by the vastly augmented consumption of those articles of manufacture and of commerce which contribute to the comforts and the decencies of life; an augmentation which has far outrun the progress of population. And while the unexampled and almost incredible use of machinery would seem to supply the place of labor, labor still finds its occupation and its reward; so wisely has Providence adjusted men's wants and desires to their condition and their capacity.

Any adequate survey, however, of the progress made

during the last half-century in the polite and the mechanic arts, in machinery and manufactures, in commerce and agriculture, in letters and in science, would require volumes. I must abstain wholly from these subjects, and turn for a moment to the contemplation of what has been done on the great question of politics and government. This is the master topic of the age; and during the whole fifty years it has intensely occupied the thoughts of men. The nature of civil government, its ends and uses, have been canvassed and investigated; ancient opinions attacked and defended; new ideas recommended and resisted, by whatever power the mind of man could bring to the controversy. From the closet and the public halls the debate has been transferred to the field; and the world has been shaken by wars of unexampled magnitude, and the greatest variety of fortune. A day of peace has at length succeeded; and now that the strife has subsided, and the smoke cleared away, we may begin to see what has actually been done, permanently changing the state and condition of human society. And, without dwelling on particular circumstances, it is most apparent, that, from the before-mentioned causes of augmented knowledge and improved individual condition, a real, substantial, and important change has taken place, and is taking place, highly favorable, on the whole, to human liberty and human happiness.

The great wheel of political revolution began to move in America. Here its rotation was guarded, regular, and safe. Transferred to the other continent, from unfortunate but natural causes, it received an irregular and violent impulse; it whirled along with a fearful celerity; till at length, like the chariot wheels in the

races of antiquity, it took fire from the rapidity of its own motion, and blazed onward, spreading conflagration and terror around.

We learn from the result of this experiment, how fortunate was our own condition, and how admirably the character of our people was calculated for setting the great example of popular governments. The possession of power did not turn the heads of the American people, for they had long been in the habit of exercising a great degree of self-control. Although the paramount authority of the parent state existed over them, yet a large field of legislation had always been open to our Colonial assemblies. They were accustomed to representative bodies and the forms of free government; they understood the doctrine of the division of power among different branches, and the necessity of checks on each. The character of our countrymen, moreover, was sober, moral, and religious; and there was little in the change to shock their feelings of justice and humanity, or even to disturb an honest prejudice. We had no domestic throne to overturn, no privileged orders to cast down, no violent changes of property to encounter. In the American Revolution, no man sought or wished for more than to defend and enjoy his own. None hoped for plunder or for spoil. Rapacity was unknown to it; the axe was not among the instruments of its accomplishment; and we all know that it could not have lived a single day under any well-founded imputation of possessing a tendency adverse to the Christian religion.

It need not surprise us, that, under circumstances less auspicious, political revolutions elsewhere, even when well intended, have terminated differently. It is, indeed, a great achievement; it is the master-work of the

world, to establish governments entirely popular on lasting foundations; nor is it easy, indeed, to introduce the popular principle at all into governments to which it has been altogether a stranger. It cannot be doubted, however, that Europe has come out of the contest, in which she has been so long engaged, with greatly superior knowledge, and, in many respects, in a highly improved condition. Whatever benefit has been acquired is likely to be retained, for it consists mainly in the acquisition of more enlightened ideas. And although kingdoms and provinces may be wrested from the hands that hold them, in the same manner they were obtained; although ordinary and vulgar power may, in human affairs, be lost as it has been won; yet it is the glorious prerogative of the empire of knowledge, that what it gains it never loses. On the contrary, it increases by the multiple of its power; all its ends become means; all its attainments, helps to new conquests. Its whole abundant harvest is but so much seed wheat, and nothing has limited, and nothing can limit the amount of ultimate product.

Under the influence of this rapidly increasing knowledge, the people have begun, in all forms of government, to think and to reason on affairs of state. Regarding government as an institution for the public good, they demand a knowledge of its operations, and a participation in its exercise. A call for the representative system, wherever it is not enjoyed, and where there is already intelligence enough to estimate its value, is perseveringly made. Where men may speak out, they demand it! where the bayonet is at their throats, they pray for it.

When Louis the Fourteenth said, "I am the State," he expressed the essence of the doctrine of unlimited

power. By the rules of that system, the people are disconnected from the state; they are its subjects, it is their lord. These ideas, founded in the love of power, and long supported by the excess and the abuse of it, are yielding, in our age, to other opinions; and the civilized world seems at last to be proceeding to the conviction of that fundamental and manifest truth, that the powers of government are but a trust, and that they cannot be lawfully exercised but for the good of the community. As knowledge is more and more extended, this conviction becomes more and more general. Knowledge, in truth, is the great sun in the firmament. Life and power are scattered with all its beams. The prayer of the Grecian champion, when enveloped in unnatural clouds and darkness, is the appropriate political supplication for the people of every country not yet blessed with free institutions:—

> "Dispel this cloud, the light of heaven restore,
> Give me to SEE,—and Ajax asks no more."

We may hope that the growing influence of enlightened sentiment will promote the permanent peace of the world. Wars to maintain family alliances, to uphold or to cast down dynasties, and to regulate successions to thrones, which have occupied so much room in the history of modern times, if not less likely to happen at all, will be less likely to become general and involve many nations, as the great principle shall be more and more established, that the interest of the world is peace, and its first great statute that every nation possesses the power of establishing a government for itself. But public opinion has attained also an influence over governments which do not admit the popular principle into their organization. A necessary respect for the judg-

ment of the world operates, in some measure, as a control over the most unlimited forms of authority. It is owing, perhaps, to this truth, that the interesting struggle of the Greeks has been suffered to go on so long, without a direct interference, either to wrest that country from its present masters, or to execute the system of pacification by force, and, with united strength, lay the neck of Christian and civilized Greek at the foot of the barbarian Turk. Let us thank God that we live in an age when something has influence besides the bayonet, and when the sternest authority does not venture to encounter the scorching power of public reproach. Any attempt of the kind I have mentioned should be met by one universal burst of indignation; the air of the civilized world ought to be made too warm to be comfortably breathed by any one who would hazard it.

It is, indeed, a touching reflection, that, while in the fulness of our country's happiness, we rear this monument to her honor, we look for instruction in our undertaking to a country which is now in fearful contest, not for works of art or memorials of glory, but for her own existence. Let her be assured that she is not forgotten in the world; that her efforts are applauded, and that constant prayers ascend for her success. And let us cherish a confident hope for her final triumph. If the true spark of religious and civil liberty be kindled, it will burn. Human agency cannot extinguish it. Like the earth's central fire, it may be smothered for a time; the ocean may overwhelm it; mountains may press it down; but its inherent and unconquerable force will heave both the ocean and the land, and at some time or other, in some place or other, the volcano will break out and flame up to heaven.

Among the great events of the half-century, we

must reckon, certainly, the revolution of South America; and we are not likely to overrate the importance of that revolution, either to the people of the country itself or to the rest of the world. The late Spanish colonies, now independent states, under circumstances less favorable, doubtless, than attended our own revolution, have yet successfully commenced their national existence. They have accomplished the great object of establishing their independence; they are known and acknowledged in the world; and although in regard to their systems of government, their sentiments on religious toleration, and their provision for public instruction, they may have yet much to learn, it must be admitted that they have risen to the condition of settled and established states more rapidly than could have been reasonably anticipated. They already furnish an exhilarating example of the difference between free governments and despotic misrule. Their commerce, at this moment, creates a new activity in all the great marts of the world. They show themselves able, by an exchange of commodities, to bear a useful part in the intercourse of nations.

A new spirit of enterprise and industry begins to prevail; all the great interests of society receive a salutary impulse; and the progress of information not only testifies to an improved condition, but itself constitutes the highest and most essential improvement.

When the battle of Bunker Hill was fought, the existence of South America was scarcely felt in the civilized world. The thirteen little Colonies of North America habitually called themselves the "Continent." Borne down by Colonial subjugation, monopoly, and bigotry, these vast regions of the South were hardly visible above the horizon. But in our day there has

been, as it were, a new creation. The southern hemisphere emerges from the sea. Its lofty mountains begin to lift themselves into the light of heaven; its broad and fertile plains stretch out, in beauty, to the eye of civilized man, and at the mighty bidding of the voice of political liberty the waters of darkness retire.

And, now, let us indulge an honest exultation in the conviction of the benefit which the example of our country has produced, and is likely to produce, on human freedom and human happiness. Let us endeavor to comprehend in all its magnitude, and to feel in all its importance, the part assigned to us in the great drama of human affairs. We are placed at the head of the system of representative and popular governments. Thus far our example shows that such governments are compatible not only with respectability and power, but with repose, with peace, with security of personal rights, with good laws, and a just administration.

We are not propagandists. Wherever other systems are preferred, either as being thought better in themselves, or as better suited to existing conditions, we leave the preference to be enjoyed. Our history hitherto proves, however, that the popular form is practicable, and that with wisdom and knowledge men may govern themselves; and the duty incumbent on us is to preserve the consistency of this cheering example, and take care that nothing weaken its authority with the world. If, in our case, the representative system ultimately fail, popular governments must be pronounced impossible. No combination of circumstances more favorable to the experiment can ever be expected to occur. The last hopes of mankind, therefore, rest with us; and if it should be proclaimed that our example had become an

argument against the experiment, the knell of popular liberty would be sounded throughout the earth.

These are excitements to duty; but they are not suggestions of doubt. Our history and our condition, all that is gone before us, and all that surrounds us, authorize the belief that popular governments, though subject to occasional variations, in form perhaps not always for the better, may yet, in their general character, be as durable and permanent as other systems. We know, indeed, that in our country any other is impossible. The *principle* of free governments adheres to the American soil. It is imbedded in it, immovable as its mountains.

And let the sacred obligations which have devolved on this generation, and on us, sink deep into our hearts. Those who established our liberty and our government are daily dropping from among us. The great trust now descends to new hands. Let us apply ourselves to that which is presented to us, as our appropriate object. We can win no laurels in a war for independence. Earlier and worthier hands have gathered them all. Nor are there places for us by the side of Solon, and Alfred, and other founders of states. Our fathers have filled them. But there remains to us a great duty of defence and preservation; and there is open to us also, a noble pursuit, to which the spirit of the times strongly invites us. Our proper business is improvement. Let our age be the age of improvement. In a day of peace, let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered. Let us cultivate

a true spirit of union and harmony. In pursuing the great objects which our condition points out to us, let us act under a settled conviction, and an habitual feeling, that these twenty-four States are one country. Let our conceptions be enlarged to the circle of our duties. Let us extend our ideas over the whole of the vast field in which we are called to act. Let our object be, OUR COUNTRY, OUR WHOLE COUNTRY, AND NOTHING BUT OUR COUNTRY. And, by the blessing of God, may that country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of Wisdom, of Peace, and of Liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration forever!

AT COOPER INSTITUTE

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

New York, February 27, 1860.

The facts with which I shall deal this evening are mainly old and familiar; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them. If there shall be any novelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations following that presentation. In his speech last autumn at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in the New York *Times,* Senator Douglas said:

"Our fathers, when they framed the government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

I fully indorse this, and I adopt it as a text for this discourse. I so adopt it because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting-point for a discussion between Republicans and that wing of the Democracy headed by Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry: What was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned?

What is the frame of government under which we live? The answer must be, "The Constitution of the United States." That Constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787, and under which the present government first went into operation, and twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789.

Who were our fathers that framed the Constitu-

tion? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is altogether true to say they fairly represented the opinion and sentiment of the whole nation at that time. Their names, being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all, need not now be repeated.

I take these "thirty-nine," for the present, as being "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." What is the question which, according to the text, those fathers understood "just as well, and even better, than we do now?"

It is this: Does the proper division of local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbid our Federal Government to control as to slavery in our Federal Territories?

Upon this, Senator Douglas holds the affirmative, and Republicans the negative. This affirmation and denial form an issue; and this issue—this question—is precisely what the text declares our fathers understood "better than we." Let us now inquire whether the "thirty-nine," or any of them, ever acted upon this question; and if they did, how they acted upon it—how they expressed that better understanding. In 1784, three years before the Constitution, the United States then owning the Northwestern Territory, and no other, the Congress of the Confederation had before them the question of prohibiting slavery in that Territory; and four of the "thirty-nine" who afterward framed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these, Roger Sherman, Thomas Mifflin, and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition, thus showing that, in their under-

standing, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory. The other of the four, James McHenry, voted against the prohibition, showing that for some cause he thought it improper to vote for it.

In 1787, still before the Constitution, but while the convention was in session framing it, and while the Northwestern Territory still was the only Territory owned by the United States, the same question of prohibiting slavery in the Territory again came before the Congress of the Confederation; and two more of the "thirty-nine" who afterward signed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on the question. They were William Blount and William Few; and they both voted for the prohibition—thus showing that in their understanding no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory. This time the prohibition became a law, being part of what is now well known as the Ordinance of '87.

The question of Federal control of slavery in the Territories seems not to have been directly before the convention which framed the original Constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine," or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question.

In 1789, by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution, an act was passed to enforce the Ordinance of '87, including the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nine"—Thomas Fitzsimmons, then a member of the House of Repre-

sentatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its stages without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without ayes and nays, which is equivalent to a unanimous passage. In this Congress there were sixteen of the thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman, Wm. S. Johnson, Roger Sherman, Robert Morris, Thos. Fitzsimmons, William Few, Abraham Baldwin, Rufus King, William Paterson, George Clymer, Richard Bassett, George Read, Pierce Butler, Daniel Carroll, and James Madison.

This shows that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority nor anything in the Constitution, properly forbade Congress to prohibit slavery in the Federal territory; else both their fidelity to correct principle, and their oath to support the Constitution, would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition.

Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-nine," was then President of the United States, and as such approved and signed the bill, thus completing its validity as a law, and thus showing that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory.

No great while after the adoption of the original Constitution, North Carolina ceded to the Federal Government the country now constituting the State of Tennessee; and a few years later Georgia ceded that which now constitutes the States of Mississippi and Alabama. In both deeds of cession it was made a condition by the ceding States that the Federal Government should not prohibit slavery in the ceded

country. Besides this, slavery was then actually in the ceded country. Under these circumstances, Congress, on taking charge of these countries, did not absolutely prohibit slavery within them. But they did interfere with it—take control of it—even there, to a certain extent. In 1798 Congress organized the Territory of Mississippi. In the act of organization they prohibited the bringing of slaves into the Territory from any place without the United States, by fine, and giving freedom to slaves so brought. This act passed both branches of Congress without yeas and nays. In that Congress were three of the "thirty-nine" who framed the original Constitution. They were John Langdon, George Read, and Abraham Baldwin. They all probably voted for it. Certainly they would have placed their opposition to it upon record if, in their understanding, any line dividing local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory.

In 1803 the Federal Government purchased the Louisiana country. Our former territorial acquisitions came from certain of our own States; but this Louisiana country was acquired from a foreign nation. In 1804 Congress gave a territorial organization to that part of it which now constitutes the State of Louisiana. New Orleans, lying within that part, was an old and comparatively large city. There were other considerable towns and settlements, and slavery was extensively and thoroughly intermingled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial Act, prohibit slavery; but they did interfere with it—take control of it—in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The sub-

stance of the provision therein made in relation to slaves was:

1st. That no slave should be imported into the Territory from foreign parts.

2nd. That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of May, 1798.

3d. That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave.

This act also was passed without ayes or nays. In the Congress which passed it there were two of the "thirty-nine." They were Abraham Baldwin and Jonathan Dayton. As stated in the case of Mississippi, it is probable they both voted for it. They would not have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it if, in their understanding, it violated either the line properly dividing local from Federal authority, or any provision of the Constitution.

In 1819-20 came and passed the Missouri question. Many votes were taken, by yeas and nays, in both branches of Congress, upon the various phases of the general question. Two of the "thirty-nine"—Rufus King and Charles Pinckney—were members of that Congress. Mr. King steadily voted for slavery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as steadily voted against slavery prohibition and against all compromises. By this, Mr. King showed that, in his understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, was violated by Congress prohibiting slavery in Federal territory; while Mr. Pinckney, by his votes,

showed that, in his understanding, there was some sufficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case.

The cases I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty-nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover.

To enumerate the persons who thus acted as being four in 1784, two in 1787, seventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1804, and two in 1819-20, there would be thirty of them. But this would be counting John Langdon, Roger Sherman, William Few, Rufus King, and George Read each twice, and Abraham Baldwin three times. The true number of those of the "thirty-nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question which, by the text, they understood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving sixteen not shown to have acted upon it in any way.

Here, then, we have twenty-three out of our thirty-nine fathers "who framed the government under which we live," who have, upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "understood just as well, and even better, than we do now;" and twenty-one of them—a clear majority of the whole "thirty-nine"—so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross political impropriety and wilful perjury if, in their understanding, any proper division between local and Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution they had made themselves, and sworn to support, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories. Thus the twenty-one acted; and, as actions speak louder than words, so actions under such responsibility speak still louder.

Two of the twenty-three voted against congressional prohibition of slavery in the Federal Territories, in the instances in which they acted upon the question. But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper division of local from Federal authority, or some provision or principle of the Constitution, stood in the way; or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition on what appeared to them to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ought to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional if, at the same time, he deems it inexpedient. It, therefore, would be unsafe to set down even the two who voted against the prohibition as having done so because, in their understanding, any proper division of local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in Federal territory.

The remaining sixteen of the "thirty-nine," so far as I have discovered, have left no record of their understanding upon the direct question of Federal control of slavery in the Federal Territories. But there is much reason to believe that their understanding upon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty-three compeers, had it been manifested at all.

For the purpose of adhering rigidly to the text, I have purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any person, however

distinguished, other than the thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution; and, for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested by any of the "thirty-nine" even on any other phase of the general question of slavery. If we should look into their acts and declarations on those other phases, as the foreign slave-trade, and the morality and policy of slavery generally, it would appear to us that on the direct question of Federal control of slavery in Federal Territories, the sixteen, if they had acted at all, would probably have acted just as the twenty-three did. Among that sixteen were several of the most noted anti-slavery men of those times—as Dr. Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and Gouverneur Morris—while there was not one now known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John Rutledge, of South Carolina.

The sum of the whole is that of our thirty-nine fathers who framed the original Constitution, twenty-one—a clear majority of the whole—certainly understood that no proper division of local from Federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control slavery in the Federal Territories; while all the rest had probably the same understanding. Such, unquestionably, was the understanding of our fathers who framed the original Constitution; and the text affirms that they understood the question "better than we."

But, so far, I have been considering the understanding of the question manifested by the framers of the original Constitution. In and by the original instrument, a mode was provided for amending it; and, as I have already stated, the present frame of

"the government under which we live" consists of that original, and twelve amendatory articles framed and adopted since. Those who now insist that Federal control of slavery in Federal Territories violates the Constitution, point us to the provisions which they suppose it thus violates; and, as I understand, they all fix upon provisions in these amendatory articles, and not in the original instrument. The Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, plant themselves upon the fifth amendment, which provides that no person shall be deprived of "life, liberty, or property without due process of law;" while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the tenth amendment, providing that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution" "are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now it so happens that these amendments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution—the identical Congress which passed the act, already mentioned, enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory. Not only was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same individual men who, at the same session, and at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward maturity, these constitutional amendments, and this act prohibiting slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The constitutional amendments were introduced before, and passed after, the act enforcing the ordinance of '87; so that, during the whole pendency of the act to enforce the ordinance, the constitutional amendments were also pending.

The seventy-six members of that Congress, includ-

ing sixteen of the framers of the original Constitution, as before stated, were pre-eminently our fathers who framed that part of "the government under which we live" which is now claimed as forbidding the Federal Government to control slavery in the Federal Territories.

Is it not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that Congress deliberately framed, and carried to maturity at the same time, are absolutely inconsistent with each other? And does not such affirmation become impudently absurd when coupled with the other affirmation, from the same mouth, that those who did the two things alleged to be inconsistent, understood whether they really were inconsistent better than we—better than he who affirms that they are inconsistent?

It is surely safe to assume that the thirty-nine framers of the original Constitution, and the seventy-six members of the Congress which framed the amendments thereto, taken together, do certainly include those who may be fairly called "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." And so assuming, I defy any man to show that any one of them ever, in his whole life, declared that, in his understanding, any proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories. I go a step further. I defy any one to show that any living man in the world ever did, prior to the beginning of the present century (and I might almost say prior to the beginning of the last half of the present century), declare that, in his understanding, any

proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories. To those who now so declare I give not only "our fathers who framed the government under which we live," but with them all other living men within the century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them.

Now, and here, let me guard a little against being misunderstood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our fathers did. To do so would be to discard all the lights of current experience—to reject all progress, all improvement. What I do say is that if we would supplant the opinions and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so clear, that even their great authority, fairly considered and weighed, cannot stand; and most surely not in a case whereof we ourselves declare they understood the question better than we.

If any man at this day sincerely believes that a proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which he can. But he has no right to mislead others, who have less access to history, and less leisure to study it, into the false belief that "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" were of the same opinion—thus substituting falsehood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument.

If any man at this day sincerely believes "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" used and applied principles, in other cases, which ought to have led them to understand that a proper division of local from Federal authority, or some part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so. But he should, at the same time, brave the responsibility of declaring that, in his opinion, he understands their principles better than they did themselves; and especially should he not shirk that responsibility by asserting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

But enough! Let all who believe that "our fathers who framed the government under which we live understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now," speak as they spoke, and act as they acted upon it. This is all Republicans ask—all Republicans desire—in relation to slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil not to be extended, but to be tolerated and protected only because of and so far as its actual presence amongst us makes that toleration and protection a necessity. Let all the guaranties those fathers gave it be not grudgingly, but fully and fairly maintained. For this Republicans contend, and with this, so far as I know or believe, they will be content.

And now, if they would listen—as I suppose they will not—I would address a few words to the Southern people.

I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are

not inferior to any other people. Still, when you speak of us Republicans, you do so only to denounce us as reptiles, or, at the best, as no better than outlaws. You will grant a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing like it to "Black Republicans." In all your contentions with one another, each of you deems an unconditional condemnation of "Black Republicanism" as the first thing to be attended to. Indeed, such condemnation of us seems to be an indispensable prerequisite—license, so to speak—among you to be admitted or permitted to speak at all. Now can you or not be prevailed upon to pause and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or even to yourselves? Bring forward your charges and specifications, and then be patient long enough to hear us deny or justify.

You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section—gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet, are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the truth plainly is, that your proof does not touch the issue. The fact that we get no votes in your section is a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by

some wrong principle or practice. If we do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault is ours; but this brings you to where you ought to have started—to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of ours, or for any other object, then our principle, and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and denounced as such. Meet us, then, on the question of whether our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so meet us as if it were possible that something may be said on our side. Do you accept the challenge? No! Then you really believe that the principle which "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" thought so clearly right as to adopt it, and indorse it again and again, upon their official oaths, is in fact so clearly wrong as to demand your condemnation without a moment's consideration.

Some of you delight to flaunt in our faces the warning against sectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning, he had, as President of the United States, approved and signed an act of Congress enforcing the prohibition of slavery in the Northwestern Territory, which act embodied the policy of the government upon that subject up to and at the very moment he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned it, he wrote Lafayette that he considered that prohibition a wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we should at some time have a confederacy of free States.

Bearing this in mind and seeing that sectionalism

has since arisen upon this same subject, is that warning a weapon in your hands against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washington himself speak, would he cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy, or upon you, who repudiate it? We respect that warning of Washington and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it.

But you say you are conservative—eminently conservative—while we are revolutionary, destructive, or something of the sort. What is conservatism? Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, the identical old policy on the point in controversy which was adopted by "our fathers who framed the government under which we live;" while you with one accord reject, and scout, and spit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disagree among yourselves as to what that substitute shall be. You are divided on new propositions and plans, but you are unanimous in rejecting and denouncing the old policy of the fathers. Some of you are for reviving the foreign slave-trade; some for a Congressional slave code for the Territories; some for Congress forbidding the Territories to prohibit slavery within their limits; some for maintaining slavery in the Territories through the judiciary; some for the "gur-reat pur-rinciple" that "if one man would enslave another, no third man should object," fantastically called "popular sovereignty;" but never a man among you is in favor of Federal prohibition of slavery in Federal Territories, according to the practice of "our fathers who framed the

government under which we live." Not one of all your various plans can show a precedent or an advocate in the century within which our government originated. Consider, then, whether your claim of conservatism for yourselves, and your charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations.

Again, you say we have made the slavery question more prominent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent, but we deny that we made it so. It was not we, but you, who discarded the old policy of the fathers. We resisted, and still resist, your innovation; and thence comes the greater prominence of the question. Would you have that question reduced to its former proportions? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. If you would have the peace of the old times, readopt the precepts and policy of the old times.

You charge that we stir up insurrections among your slaves. We deny it; and what is your proof? Harper's Ferry! John Brown!! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper's Ferry enterprise. If any member of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it, or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable for not designating the man and proving the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable for asserting it, and especially for persisting in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious slander.

Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair, but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold no doctrine, and make no declaration, which were not held to and made by "our fathers who framed the government under which we live." You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important state elections were near at hand, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite fulfilled. Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely, this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with "our fathers who framed the government under which we live," declare our belief that slavery is wrong; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this. For anything we say or do, the slaves would scarcely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrepresentations of us in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves each faction charges the other with sympathy with Black Republicanism; and then, to give point to the charges, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood, and thunder among the slaves.

Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the Republican party was organized. What induced the Southampton insurrection, twenty-eight years ago, in which at least three times as many lives were lost as at Harper's Ferry? You can scarcely stretch your very elastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was "got up by Black Republicanism." In the present state of things in the United States, I do not think a general or even a very extensive, slave insurrection is possible. The indispensable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendiary freemen, black or white, supply it. The explosive materials are everywhere in parcels; but there neither are, nor can be supplied, the indispensable connecting trains.

Much is said by Southern people about the affection of slaves for their masters and mistresses; and a part of it, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised and communicated to twenty individuals before some one of them, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divulge it. This is the rule; and the slave revolution in Hayti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar circumstances. The gunpowder plot of British history, though not connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case, only about twenty were admitted to the secret; and yet one of them, in his anxiety to save a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by consequence, averted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen, and open or stealthy assassinations in the field, and local revolts extending to a score or so, will continue to occur as

the natural results of slavery; but no general insurrection of slaves, as I think, can happen in this country for a long time. Whoever much fears, or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed.

In the language of Mr. Jefferson, uttered many years ago, "It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably, and in such slow degrees, as that the evil will wear off insensibly; and their places be, *pari passu,* filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up."

Mr. Jefferson did not mean to say, nor do I, that the power of emancipation is in the Federal Government. He spoke of Virginia; and, as to the power of emancipation, I speak of the slaveholding States only. The Federal Government, however, as we insist, has the power of restraining the extension of the institution—the power to insure that a slave insurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from slavery.

John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a slave insurrection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves, in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact, it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their ignorance, saw plainly enough it could not succeed. That affair, in its philosophy, corresponds with the many attempts, related in history, at the assassination of kings and emperors. An enthusiast broods over the oppression of a people till he fancies himself commissioned by Heaven to liberate them. He ventures the attempt, which ends in little else than his own execution. Or

sini's attempt on Louis Napoleon, and John Brown's attempt at Harper's Ferry, were, in their philosophy, precisely the same. The eagerness to cast blame on old England in the one case, and on New England in the other, does not disprove the sameness of the two things.

And how much would it avail you, if you could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's Book, and the like, break up the Republican organization? Human action can be modified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed. There is a judgment and a feeling against slavery in this nation, which cast at least a million and a half of votes. You cannot destroy that judgment and feeling—that sentiment—by breaking up the political organization which rallies around it. You can scarcely scatter and disperse an army which has been formed into order in the face of your heaviest fire; but if you could, how much would you gain by forcing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful channel of the ballot-box into some other channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Browns be lessened or enlarged by the operation?

But you will break up the Union rather than submit to a denial of your constitutional rights.

That has a somewhat reckless sound; but it would be palliated, if not fully justified, were we proposing, by the mere force of numbers, to deprive you of some right plainly written down in the Constitution. But we are proposing no such thing.

When you make these declarations you have a specific and well-understood allusion to an assumed constitutional right of yours to take slaves into the

Federal Territories, and to hold them there as property. But no such right is specially written in the Constitution. That instrument is literally silent about any such right. We, on the contrary, deny that such a right has any existence in the Constitution, even by implication.

Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is that you will destroy the government, unless you be allowed to construe and force the Constitution as you please, on all points in dispute between you and us. You will rule or ruin in all events.

This, plainly stated, is your language. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the disputed constitutional question in your favor. Not quite so. But waiving the lawyer's distinction between dictum and decision, the court has decided the question for you in a sort of way. The court has substantially said, it is your constitutional right to take slaves into the Federal Territories, and to hold them there as property. When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was made in a divided court, by a bare majority of the judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it; that it is so made as that its avowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning, and that it was mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact—the statement in the opinion that "the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution." An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not "distinctly and expressly affirmed" in it. Bear in mind, the judges do not pledge their judicial opinion that such

right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution; but they pledge their veracity that it is "distinctly and expressly" affirmed there—"Distinctly," that is, not mingled with anything else—"expressly," that is, in words meaning just that, without the aid of any infer- 5 ence, and susceptible of no other meaning.

If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the word "slave" nor "slavery" is to be 10 found in the Constitution, nor the word "property" even, in any connection with language alluding to the thing slave, or slavery; and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a "person;" and wherever his master's legal right in 15 relation to him is alluded to, it is spoken of as "service or labor which may be due"— as a debt payable in service or labor. Also it would be open to show, by contemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and slavery, instead of speaking of them, 20 was employed on purpose to exclude from the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man. To show all this is easy and certain.

When this obvious mistake of the judges shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect 25 that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and reconsider the conclusion based upon it?

And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" —the men who made the Constitution—decided this 30 same constitutional question in our favor long ago; decided it without division among themselves when making the decision; without division among themselves about the meaning of it after it was made, and,

so far as any evidence is left, without basing it upon any mistaken statement of facts.

Under all these circumstances, do you really feel yourselves justified to break up this government unless such a court decision as yours is shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political action? But you will not abide the election of a Republican president! In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us! That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "Stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murderer!"

To be sure, what the robber demanded of me—my money—was my own; and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was no more my own than my vote is my own; and the threat of death to me, to extort my money, and the threat of destruction to the Union, to extort my vote, can scarcely be distinguished in principle.

A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony with one another Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the Southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them.

Will they be satisfied if the Territories be uncon-

ditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against us, the Territories are scarcely mentioned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the future, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know, because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation.

The question recurs, "What will satisfy them?" Simply this: we must not only let them alone, but we must somehow convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so trying to convince them from the very beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches we have constantly protested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.

These natural and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? This, and this only: cease to call slavery wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly —done in acts as well as in words. Silence will not be tolerated—we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Senator Douglas's new sedition law must be enacted and enforced, suppressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, whether made in politics, in presses, in pulpits, or in private. We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure.

We must pull down our free-State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.

I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone; do nothing to us, and say what you please about slavery." But we do let them alone —have never disturbed them—so that, after all, it is what we say which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accuse us of doing, until we cease saying.

I am also aware they have not as yet in terms demanded the overthrow of our free-State constitutions. Yet those constitutions declare the wrong of slavery with more solemn emphasis than do all other sayings against it; and when all these other sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these constitutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the demand. It is nothing to the contrary that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for the reason they do, they can voluntarily stop nowhere short of this consummation. Holding, as they do, that slavery is morally right and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it as a legal right and a social blessing.

Nor can we justifiably withhold this on any ground save our conviction that slavery is wrong. If slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it are themselves wrong, and should be silenced and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality—its universality; if it is wrong, they cannot justly insist upon its extension—its en-

largement. All they ask we could readily grant, if we thought slavery right; all we ask they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right and our thinking it wrong is the precise fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition as being right; but thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast our votes with their view and against our own? In view of our moral, social, and political responsibilities, can we do this?

Wrong as we think slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the national Territories, and to overrun us here in these free states? If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong: vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead man; such as a policy of "don't care" on a question about which all true men do care; such as Union appeals beseeching true Union men to yield to Disunionists, reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance; such as invocations to Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said and undo what Washington did.

Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false

accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

AT INDEPENDENCE HALL

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Philadelphia, Feb. 21, 1861

I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself standing here in this place, where were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle from which sprang the institutions under which we live. You have kindly suggested to me that in my hands is the task of restoring peace to the present distracted condition of the country. I can say in return, sir, that all the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn, so far as I have been able to draw them, from the sentiments which originated in and were given to the world from this hall. I have never had a feeling, politically, that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here, and framed and adopted that Declaration of Independence. I have pondered over the toils that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that independence. I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the mother-land, but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world, for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the

weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Now, my friends, can this country be saved upon that basis? If it can, I will consider myself one of the happiest of men in the world if I can help to save it. If it cannot be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender it. Now, in my view of the present aspect of affairs, there need be no bloodshed or war. There is no necessity for it. I am not in favor of such a course; and I may say in advance that there will be no bloodshed unless it be forced upon the government, and then it will be compelled to act in self-defense.

My friends, this is wholly an unexpected speech, and I did not expect to be called upon to say a word when I came here. I supposed it was merely to do something towards raising the flag—I may, therefore, have said something indiscreet. I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and if it be the pleasure of Almighty God, die by.

FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

March 4, 1861

FELLOW CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES—In compliance with a custom as old as the government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly, and to take in your presence the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of his office."

I do not consider it necessary at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety or excitement.

Apprehension seems to exist, among the people of the Southern States, that by the accession of a republican administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations, and had never recanted them. And more than this, they placed in the platform for my ac-

ceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:—

"*Resolved*—That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the states, and especially the right of each state to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to the balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend, and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any state or territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."

I now reiterate these sentiments; and, in doing so, I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible, that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given, will be cheerfully given to all the states, when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section as to another.

There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:—

"No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the law-

giver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves, whose cases come within the terms of this clause, "shall be delivered up," their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not, with nearly equal unanimity, frame and pass a law by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by state authority; but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him, or to others, by which authority it is done. And should any one, in any case, be content that his oath shall go unkept, on a mere unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?

Again, in any law upon the subject, ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and human jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not, in any case, surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well, at the same time, to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states?"

I shall take the official oath to-day with no mental reservation, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hypercritical rule. And while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed, than to violate any of them, trusting

to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a president under our national constitution. During that period, fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens have, in succession, administered the executive branch of the government. They have conducted it through many perils, and generally with great success. Yet, with all this scope for precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four years, under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

I hold that, in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the union of these states is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national government, and the Union will endure forever—it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

Again, if the United States be not a government proper, but an association of states in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak; but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that, in legal contemplation, the Union is perpetual, confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed in fact, by the articles of association in

1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen states expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the articles of confederation in 1778. And, finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was "to form a more perfect Union."

But if destruction of the Union, by one, or by a part only, of the states, be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before, the Constitution having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

It follows, from these views, that no state upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence within any state or states, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary, or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I, therefore, consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the states. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part; and I shall perform it, so far as practicable, unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means, or, in some authoritative manner, direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself.

In doing this there need be no bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places

belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be but necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States in any interior locality shall be so great and universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating, and so nearly impracticable withal, I deem it better to forego, for the time, the uses of such offices.

The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible, the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed, unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper, and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing, and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles, and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.

That there are persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events, and are glad of any pretext to do it, I will neither affirm nor deny; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really love the Union, may I not speak?

Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so des-

perate a step while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from—will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? 5

All profess to be content in the Union, if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right, plainly written in the Constitution, has been denied? I think not. Happily the human mind is so constituted that no party can reach to the audacity of 10 doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If, by the mere force of numbers, a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might, in a moral point 15 of view, justify revolution—certainly would if such a right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital rights of minorities and of individuals are so plainly assured to them by affirmation and negations, guarantees and prohibitions in the Constitution, that 20 controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate, nor any document of reasonable length contain, express pro- 25 visions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by state authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit slavery in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery 30 in the territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into ma-

jorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the government must cease. There is no other alternative; for continuing the government is acquiescence on one side or the other. If a minority in such case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which, in turn, will divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy, a year or two hence, arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this.

Is there such perfect identity of interests among the states to compose a new Union, as to produce harmony only, and prevent renewed secession?

Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it, does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism, in some form, is all that is left.

I do not forget the position assumed by some, that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court; nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding, in any case, upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration in all parallel cases, by all other departments of the government. And while

it is obviously possible that such decisions may be erroneous in any given case, still, the evil effect following it being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be overruled, and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.

Nor is there in this view any assault upon the Court or the Judges. It is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases properly brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes. One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive slave clause of the Constitution, and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave-trade, are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, cannot be perfectly cured; and it would be worse, in both cases, after the separation of the sections than before. The foreign slave-trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived, without restriction, in one section; while fugitive slaves, now only

partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all by the other.

Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. It is impossible then to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before. Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it. I cannot be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the National Constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendment, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself, and I should, under existing circumstances, favor, rather than oppose, a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it. I will venture to add, that to me the convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amend-

ments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only permitting them to take or reject propositions originated by others, not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution—which amendment, however, I have not seen—has passed Congress, to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of the states, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments, so far as to say that, holding such a provision now to be implied constitutional law, I have no objections to its being made express and irrevocable.

The chief magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have conferred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the states. The people themselves can do this also if they choose; but the executive, as such, has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the represent government as it came to his hands, and to transmit it, unimpaired by him, to his successor.

Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of Nations, with his eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail, by the judgment of this great tribunal of the American people.

By the frame of the government under which we live, the same people have wisely given their public servants

but little power for mischief and have with equal wisdom, provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals. While the people retain their virtue and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can very seriously injure the government in the short space of four years.

My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. It there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied, still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust, in the best way, all our present difficulty.

In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you.

You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect, and defend" it.

I am loth to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection.

The mystic chord of memory, stretching from every battle-field and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

LETTER TO HORACE GREELEY.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

EXECUTIVE MANSION.

Washington, August 22, 1862.

Hon. Horace Greeley:

DEAR SIR:—I have just read yours of the 19th, addressed to myself through the New York *Tribune*. If there be in it any statements or assumptions of fact which I may know to be erroneous, I do not, now and here, controvert them. If there be in it any inferences which I may believe to be falsely drawn, I do not, now and here, argue against them. If there be perceptible in it an impatient and dictatorial tone, I waive it in deference to an old friend whose heart I have always supposed to be right.

As to the policy I "seem to be pursuing," as you say, I have not meant to leave anyone in doubt.

I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored, the nearer the Union will be the "Union as it was." If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and it is not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing

some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe that doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views.

I have stated my purpose according to my view of official duty; and I intend no modifications of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free.

Yours,

A. LINCOLN.

SPEECH AT GETTYSBURG

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

November 19, 1863

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

March 4, 1865

Fellow-Countrymen—At this second appearing to take the oath of the Presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement somewhat in detail of a course to be pursued seemed very fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of four years, during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the nation, little that is new could be presented.

The progress of our arms, upon which all else chiefly depends, is as well known to the public as to myself, and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this four years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it, all sought to avoid it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city, seeking to destroy it with war—seeking to dissolve the Union and divide the effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came. One-eighth

of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union, but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it.

Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease, even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding.

Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayer of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. Woe unto the world because of offences, for it must needs be that offences come, but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh. If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of these offences which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, shall we discern there any departure from those Divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this

mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with 5 the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so, still it must be said, that the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

"With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, 10 let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations. 15

LAST PUBLIC ADDRESS

BY ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Washington, April 11, 1865.

We meet this evening not in sorrow, but in gladness of heart. The evacuation of Petersburg and Richmond, and the surrender of the principal insurgent army, give hope of a righteous and speedy peace, whose joyous expression cannot be restrained. In the midst of this, however, He from whom all blessings flow must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared, and will be duly promulgated. Nor must those whose harder part, gives us the cause of rejoicing be overlooked. Their honors must not be parceled out with others. I myself was near the front, and had the high pleasure of transmitting much of the good news to you; but no part of the honor for plan or execution is mine. To General Grant, his skilful officers and brave men, all belongs. The gallant navy stood ready, but was not in reach to take active part.

By these recent successes the reinauguration of the national authority—reconstruction—which has had a large share of thought from the first, is pressed much more closely upon our attention. It is fraught with great difficulty. Unlike a case of war between independent nations, there is no authorized organ for us to treat with—no one man has authority to give up the rebellion for any other man. We simply must begin with and mold from disorganized and discordant elements. Nor is it a small additional embarrassment that we, the loyal people, differ among ourselves as to

the mode, manner and measure of reconstruction. As a general rule, I abstain from reading the reports of attacks upon myself, wishing not to be provoked by that to which I cannot properly offer an answer. In spite of this precaution, however, it comes to my knowledge that I am much censured for some supposed agency in setting up and seeking to sustain the new State government of Louisiana.

In this I have done just so much as, and no more than, the public knows. In the annual message of December, 1863, and in the accompanying proclamation, I presented a plan of reconstruction, as the phrase goes, which I promised, if adopted by any State, should be acceptable to and sustained by the executive government of the nation. I distinctly stated that this was not the only plan which might possibly be acceptable, and I also distinctly protested that the executive claimed no right to say when or whether members should be admitted to seats in Congress from such States. This plan was in advance submitted to the then Cabinet, and distinctly approved by every member of it. One of them suggested that I should then and in that connection apply the Emancipation Proclamation to the theretofore excepted parts of Virginia and Louisiana; that I should drop the suggestion about apprenticeship for freed people, and that I should omit the protest against my own power in regard to the admission of members to Congress. But even he approved every part and parcel of the plan which has since been employed or touched by the action of Louisiana.

The new constitution of Louisiana, declaring emancipation for the whole State, practically applies the proclamation to the part previously excepted. It does not adopt apprenticeship for freed people, and it is silent,

as it could not well be otherwise, about the admission of members to Congress. So that, as it applies to Louisiana, every member of the Cabinet fully approved the plan. The message went to Congress, and I received many commendations of the plan, written and verbal, and not a single objection to it from any professed emancipationist came to my knowledge until after the news reached Washington that the people of Louisiana had begun to move in accordance with it. From about July, 1862, I had corresponded with different persons supposed to be interested [in] seeking a reconstruction of a State government for Louisiana. When the message of 1863, with the plan before mentioned, reached New Orleans, General Banks wrote me that he was confident that the people, with his military coöperation, would reconstruct substantially on that plan. I wrote to him and some of them to try it. They tried it, and the result is known. Such has been my only agency in getting up the Louisiana government.

As to sustaining it, my promise is out, as before stated. But as bad promises are better broken than kept, I shall treat this as a bad promise, and break it whenever I shall be convinced that keeping it is adverse to the public interest; but I have not yet been so convinced. I have been shown a letter on this subject, supposed to be an able one, in which the writer expresses regret that my mind has not seemed to be definitely fixed on the question whether the seceded States, so called, are in the Union or out of it. It would perhaps add astonishment to his regret were he to learn that since I have found professed Union men endeavoring to make that question, I have purposely forborne any public expression upon it. As appears to me, that question has not been, nor yet is, a practically material one, and that any discussion of it,

while it thus remains practically immaterial, could have no effect other than the mischievous one of dividing our friends. As yet, whatever it may hereafter become, that question is bad as the basis of a controversy, and good for nothing at all—a merely pernicious abstraction.

We all agree that the seceded States, so called, are out of their proper practical relation with the Union, and that the sole object of the government, civil and military, in regard to those States is to again get them into that proper practical relation. I believe that it is not only possible, but in fact easier, to do this without deciding or even considering whether these States have ever been out of the Union, than with it. Finding themselves safely at home, it would be utterly immaterial whether they had ever been abroad. Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restoring the proper practical relations between these States and the Union, and each forever after innocently indulge his own opinion whether in doing the acts he brought the States from without into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it. The amount of constituency, so to speak, on which the new Louisiana government rests, would be more satisfactory to all if it contained 50,000, or 30,000, or even 20,000, instead of only about 12,000, as it does. It is also unsatisfactory to some that the elective franchise is not given to the colored man. I would myself prefer that it were now conferred on the very intelligent, and on those who serve our cause as soldiers.

Still, the question is not whether the Louisiana government, as it stands, is quite all that is desirable. The question is, will it be wiser to take it as it is and help to improve it, or to reject and disperse it? Can Louisiana be brought into proper practical relation with the

Union sooner by sustaining or by discarding her new State government? Some twelve thousand voters in the heretofore slave State of Louisiana have sworn allegiance to the Union, assumed to be the rightful political power of the State, held elections, organized a State government, adopted a free State constitution, giving the benefit of public schools equally to black and white, and empowering the legislature to confer the elective franchise upon the colored man. Their legislature has already voted to ratify the constitutional amendment recently passed by Congress, abolishing slavery throughout the nation. These 12,000 persons are thus fully committed to the Union and to perpetual freedom in the State—committed to the very things, and nearly all the things, the nation wants—and they ask the nation's recognition and its assistance to make good their committal.

Now, if we reject and spurn them, we do our utmost to disorganize and disperse them. We, in effect, say to the white man: You are worthless or worse; we will neither help you, nor be helped by you. To the blacks we say: This cup of liberty which these, your old masters, hold to your lips we will dash from you, and leave you to the chances of gathering the spilled and scattered contents in some vague and undefined when, where, and how. If this course, discouraging and paralyzing both white and black, has any tendency to bring Louisiana into proper practical relations with the Union, I have so far been unable to perceive it. If, on the contrary, we recognize and sustain the new government of Louisiana, the converse of all this is made true. We encourage the hearts and nerve the arms of the 12,000 to adhere to their work, and argue for it, and proselyte for it, and fight for it, and feed it, and grow it, and ripen it to a complete success. The colored man, too, in seeing

all united for him, is inspired with vigilance, and energy, and daring, to the same end. Grant that he desires the elective franchise, will he not attain it sooner by saving the already advanced steps toward it than by running backward over them? Concede that the new government of Louisiana is only to what it should be as the egg is to the fowl, we shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it.

Again, if we reject Louisiana we also reject one vote in favor of the proposed amendment to the national Constitution. To meet this proposition it has been argued that no more than three-fourths of those States which have not attempted secession are necessary to validly ratify the amendment. I do not commit myself against this further than to say that such a ratification would be questionable, and sure to be persistently questioned, while a ratification by three-fourths of all the States would be unquestioned and unquestionable. I repeat the question: Can Louisiana be brought into proper practical relation with the Union sooner by sustaining or by discarding her new State government? What has been said of Louisiana will apply generally to other States. And yet so great peculiarities pertain to each State, and such important and sudden changes occur in the same State, and withal so new and unprecedented is the whole case that no exclusive and inflexible plan can safely be prescribed as to details and collaterals. Such exclusive and inflexible plan would surely become a new entanglement. Important principles may and must be inflexible. In the present situation, as the phrase goes, it may be my duty to make some new announcement to the people of the South. I am considering, and shall not fail to act when satisfied that action will be proper.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

From "THE SPECTATOR," LONDON, APRIL 25, AND MAY 2, 1891.

* * * * * * * *

THE English-speaking world will never read the story of the Rebellion without a thrill of pride and exultation. Heroic and inspiring as was the achievement of the Puritans in throwing off the tyranny of the Stuarts, and establishing in its place, not license or anarchy, but a wise and liberal polity, the veiling hand of time diminishes for modern men its distinctness and reality. With the defense of the Union it is different. We can almost hear the reverberations of the cannon at Vicksburg, and our hands may still clasp the hands of those who fought for the life of the Nation at Gettysburg and Chattanooga. The glory won by the English race is so near, that it still stirs the blood like a trumpet to read of the patriotism of the men who fought at the call of Lincoln. Nothing is more admirable, as nothing is more dramatic in recorded history, than the manner in which the North sprang to arms at the news that the nation's flag had been fired on at Fort Sumter. It is all very well to hire soldiers at so much a day and send them to the front with salutes and rejoicings, but the action of the Eastern and Western States meant a great deal more than this. It meant a voluntary sacrifice on the part of men who had nothing to gain and everything to lose by throwing over a life of ease or profit to shoulder a musket or serve a gun. A continent was on fire.

It is one of the greatest of Lincoln's claims to admiration, that though he sympathized with the fervor and enthusiasm of his countrymen, he was not carried away by it. He was one of those rare men who can at once be zealous and moderate, who are kindled by great ideas, and who yet retain complete control of the critical faculty. And more than this, Lincoln was a man who could be reserved without the chill of reserve. Again, he could make allowance for demerits in a principle or a human instrument, without ever falling into the purblindness of cynicism. He often acted in his dealings with men much as a professed cynic might have acted; but his conduct was due, not to any disbelief in virtue, but to a wide tolerance and a clear knowledge of human nature. He saw things as a disillusionised man sees them, and yet in the bad sense he never suffered any disillusionment. For suffusing and combining his other qualities was a serenity of mind which affected the whole man. He viewed the world too much as a whole to be greatly troubled or perplexed over its accidents. To this serenity of mind was due an almost total absence of indignation in the ordinary sense. Generals might half-ruin the cause for the sake of some trumpery quarrel, or in order to gain some petty personal advantage; office-seekers might worry at the very crisis of the nation's fate; but none of the pettiness, the spites, or the follies could rouse in Lincoln the impatience or the indignation that would have been wakened in ordinary men. Pity, and nothing else, was the feeling such exhibitions occasioned him. Lincoln seems to have felt the excuse that tempers the guilt of every mortal transgression. His largeness and tenderness of nature made him at heart a universal apologist. He was, of course, too practical and too great a statesman to let this sensibility

to the excuses that can be made for human conduct induce him to allow misdeeds to go unpunished or uncorrected. He acted as firmly and as severely as if he had experienced the most burning indignation; but the moment we come to Lincoln's real feelings, we see that he is never incensed, and that, even in its most legitimate form, the desire for retribution is absent from his mind. *Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner,* was the secret of his attitude towards human affairs. That is not the highest wisdom; but it errs on the right, and also on the rare, side.

So much for the intellectual side of Lincoln's nature. Behind it was a personality of singular charm. Tenderness and humor were its main characteristics. As he rode through a forest in spring-time, he would keep on dismounting to put back the young birds that had fallen from their nests. There was not a situation in life which could not afford him the subject for a kindly smile. It needed a character so full of gentleness and good temper to sustain the intolerable weight of responsibility which the war threw upon the shoulders of the President. Most men would have been crushed by the burden. His serenity of temper saved Lincoln. Except when the miserable necessity of having to sign the order for a military execution took away his sleep, he carried on his work without any visible sign of overstrain. Not the least of Lincoln's achievements is to be found in the fact that though for four years he wielded a power and a personal authority greater than that exercised by any monarch on earth, he never gave satirist or caricaturist the slightest real ground for declaring that his sudden rise to world-wide fame had turned the head of the backwoodsman. Under the circumstances, there would have been every excuse for

Lincoln, had he assumed to his subordinates somewhat the bearing of the autocrat he was. It is a sign of the absolute sincerity and good sense of the President that he was under no sort of a temptation to do so. Lincoln was before all things a gentleman, and the good taste inseparable from that character made it impossible for him to be spoiled by power and position. This grace and strength of character is never better shown than in the letters to his generals, victorious or defeated. When they were beaten, he was anxious to share the blame; when victorious, he was instant to deny by anticipation any rumor that he had inspired the strategy of the campaign. If a general had to be reprimanded, he did it as only the most perfect of gentlemen could do it. He could convey the severest censure without inflicting any wound that would not heal, and this not by using roundabout expressions, but in the plainest language. "He writes to me like a father," were the heart-felt words of a commander who had been reproved by the President. Throughout these communications, the manner in which he not only conceals, but altogether sinks, all sense that the men to whom they were addressed were, in effect, his subordinates, is worthy of special note. "A breath could make them, as a breath had made," and yet Lincoln writes as if his generals were absolutely independent.

We have said something of Lincoln as a man and as the leader of a great cause. We desire now to dwell upon a point which is often neglected in considering the career of the hero of the Union, but which, from the point of view of letters, is of absorbing interest. No criticism of Mr. Lincoln can be in any sense adequate which does not deal with his astonishing power over words. It is not too much to say of him that he is

among the greatest masters of prose ever produced by the English race. Self-educated, or rather not educated at all in the ordinary sense, as he was, he contrived to obtain an insight and power in the handling of the mechanism of letters such as has been given to few men of his, or, indeed, in any age. That the gift of oratory should be a natural gift, is understandable enough, for the methods of the orator, like those of the poet, are primarily sensuous, and may well be instinctive. Mr. Lincoln's achievement seems to show that no less is the writing of prose an endowment of Nature. Mr. Lincoln did not get his ability to handle prose through his gift of speech. That these are separate, though coordinate, faculties, is a matter beyond dispute, for many of the great orators of the world have proved themselves exceedingly inefficient in the matter of deliberate composition. Mr. Lincoln enjoyed both gifts. His letters, dispatches, memoranda, and written addresses are even better than his speeches; and in speaking thus of Mr. Lincoln's prose, we are not thinking merely of certain pieces of inspired rhetoric. We do not praise his work because, like Mr. Bright, he could exercise his power of coining illuminating phrases as effectively upon paper as on the platform. It is in his conduct of the pedestrian portions of composition that Mr. Lincoln's genius for prose style is exhibited. Mr. Bright's writing cannot claim to answer the description which Hazlitt has given of the successful prose-writer's performance. Mr. Lincoln's can. What Hazlitt says is complete and perfect in definition. He tells us that the prose-writer so uses his pen "that he loses no particle of the exact characteristic extreme impression of the thing he writes about;" and with equal significance he points out that "the prose-writer is master of his ma-

terials," as "the poet is the slave of his style." If these words convey a true definition, then Mr. Lincoln is a master of prose. Whatever the subject he has in hand, whether it be bald or impassioned, business-like or pathetic, we feel that we "lose no particle of the exact characteristic extreme impression" of the thing written about. We have it all, and not merely a part. Every line shows that the writer is master of his materials; that he guides the words, never the words him. This is, indeed, the predominant note throughout all Mr. Lincoln's work. We feel that he is like the engineer who controls some mighty reservoir. As he desires, he opens the various sluice-gates, but for no instant is the water not under his entire control. We are sensible in reading Mr. Lincoln's writings, that an immense force is gathered up behind him, and that in each jet that flows, every drop is meant. Some writers only leak; others half flow through determined channels, half leak away their words like a broken lock when it is emptying. The greatest, like Mr. Lincoln, send out none but clear-shaped streams.

The "Second Inaugural"—a written composition, though read to the citizens from the steps of the Capitol—well illustrates our words. Mr. Lincoln had to tell his countrymen, that, after four years' struggle, the war was practically ended. The four years' agony, the passion of love which he felt for his country, his joy in her salvation, his sense of tenderness for those who fell, of pity mixed with sternness for the men who had deluged the land with blood,—all the thoughts these feelings inspired were behind Lincoln pressing for expression. A writer of less power would have been overwhelmed. Lincoln remained master of the emotional and intellectual situation. In three or four hundred

words that burn with the heat of their compression, he tells the history of the war and reads its lesson. No nobler thoughts were ever conceived. No man ever found words more adequate to his desire. Here is the whole tale of the nation's shame and misery, of her heroic struggles to free herself therefrom, and of her victory. Had Lincoln written a hundred times as much more, he could not have said more fully what he desired to say. Every thought receives its complete expression and there is no word employed which does not directly and manifestly contribute to the development of the central thought.

As an example of Lincoln's more familiar style, we may quote from that inimitable series of letters to his generals to which we made allusion on a former occasion. The following letter was addressed to General Hooker on his being appointed to command the Army of the Potomac, after mismanagement and failure had made a change of generals absolutely necessary:—

"I have placed you at the head of the Army of the Potomac. Of course I have done this upon what appears to me to be sufficient reasons, and yet I think it best for you to know that there are some things in regard to which I am not quite satisfied with you. I believe you to be a brave and skilful soldier, which, of course, I like. I also believe you do not mix politics with your profession, in which you are right. You have confidence in yourself, which is a valuable, if not an indispensable, quality. You are ambitious, which, within reasonable bounds, does good rather than harm; but I think that, during General Burnside's command of the army, you have taken counsel of your ambition, and thwarted him as much as you could, in which you did a great wrong to the country and to a most meritorious and honorable brother-officer. I have heard, in such a way as to believe it, of your recently saying that both the army and the Government needed a dictator. Of course, it

was not for this, but in spite of it, that I have given you the command. Only those generals who gain successes can set up dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship. The Government will support you to the utmost of its ability, which is neither more nor less than it has done and will do for all commanders. I much fear that the spirit, which you have aided to infuse into the army, of criticising their commander and withholding confidence from him, will now turn upon you. I shall assist you as far as I can to put it down. Neither you nor Napoleon, if he were alive again, could get any good out of an army while such a spirit prevails in it. And now beware of rashness. Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories."

It is possible that this letter may sound too severe in tone when read without the context. If, however, the condition of the army at the time, and the intrigues of the various commanders are considered, it will be recognized as erring in no way on the side of harshness. The irony is particularly delightful, and in no sense forced. . . .

APPENDIX

A SPEECH

Delivered in the House of Commons, February 5, 1841,

By Thomas Babington Macaulay

On the twenty-ninth of January, 1841, Mr. Serjeant Talfourd obtained leave to bring in a bill to amend the law of copyright. The object of this bill was to extend the term of copyright in a book to sixty years, reckoned from the death of the writer.

On the fifth of February Mr. Serjeant Talfourd moved that the bill should be read a second time. In reply to him the following speech was made. The bill was rejected by 45 votes to 38.

Though, Sir, it is in some sense agreeable to approach a subject with which political animosities have nothing to do, I offer myself to your notice with some reluctance. It is painful to me to take a course which may possibly be misunderstood or misrepresented as unfriendly to the interests of literature and literary men. It is painful to me, I will add, to oppose my honorable and learned friend on a question which he has taken up from the purest motives, and which he regards with a parental interest. These feelings have hitherto kept me silent when the law of copyright has been under discussion. But as I am, on full consideration, satisfied that the measure before us will, if adopted, inflict grievous injury on the public, without conferring any compensating advantage on men of letters, I think it my duty to avow that opinion and to defend it.

The first thing to be done, Sir, is to settle on what

principles the question is to be argued. Are we free to legislate for the public good, or are we not? Is this a question of expediency, or is it a question of right? Many of those who have written and petitioned against the existing state of things treat the question as one of right. The law of nature, according to them, gives to every man a sacred and indefeasible property in his own ideas, in the fruits of his own reason and imagination. The legislature has indeed the power to take away this property, just as it has the power to pass an act of attainder for cutting off an innocent man's head without a trial. But, as such an act of attainder would be legal murder, so would an act invading the right of an author to his copy be, according to these gentlemen, legal robbery.

Now, Sir, if this be so, let justice be done, cost what it may. I am not prepared, like my honorable and learned friend, to agree to a compromise between right and expediency, and to commit an injustice for the public convenience. But I must say, that his theory soars far beyond the reach of my faculties. It is not necessary to go, on the present occasion, into a metaphysical inquiry about the origin of the right of property; and certainly nothing but the strongest necessity would lead me to discuss a subject so likely to be distasteful to the House. I agree, I own, with Paley in thinking that property is the creature of the law, and that the law which creates property can be defended only on this ground, that it is a law beneficial to mankind. But it is unnecessary to debate that point. For, even if I believed in a natural right of property, independent of utility and anterior to legislation, I

should still deny that this right could survive the original proprietor. Few, I apprehend, even of those who have studied in the most mystical and sentimental schools of moral philosophy, will be disposed to maintain that there is a natural law of succession older and of higher authority than any human code. If there be, it is quite certain that we have abuses to reform much more serious than any connected with the question of copywright. For this natural law can be only one; and the modes of succession in the Queen's dominions are twenty. To go no further than England, land generally descends to the eldest son. In Kent the sons share and share alike. In many districts the youngest takes the whole. Formerly a portion of a man's personal property was secured to his family; and it was only of the residue that he could dispose by will. Now he can dispose of the whole by will: but you limited his power, a few years ago, by enacting that the will should not be valid unless there were two witnesses. If a man dies intestate, his personal property generally goes according to the statute of distributions; but there are local customs which modify that statute. Now which of all these systems is conformed to the eternal standard of right? Is it primogeniture, or gavelkind, or borough English? Are wills *jure divino?* Are the two witnesses *jure divino?* Might not the *pars rationabilis* of our old law have a fair claim to be regarded as of celestial institution? Was the statute of distributions enacted in Heaven long before it was adopted by parliament? Or is it to Custom of York, or to Custom of London, that this pre-eminence belongs? Surely, Sir, even those who hold that there is a natural right of property

must admit that rules prescribing the manner in which the effects of deceased persons shall be distributed are purely arbitrary, and originate altogether in the will of the legislature. If so, Sir, there is no controversy between my honorable and learned friend and myself as to the principles on which this question is to be argued. For the existing law gives an author copyright during his natural life; nor do I propose to invade that privilege, which I should, on the contrary, be prepared to defend strenuously against any assailant. The only point in issue between us is, how long after an author's death the state shall recognize a copyright in his representatives and assigns; and it can, I think, hardly be disputed by any rational man that this is a point which the legislature is free to determine in the way which may appear to be most conducive to the general good.

We may now, therefore, I think, descend from these high regions, where we are in danger of being lost in the clouds, to firm ground and clear light. Let us look at this question like legislators, and, after fairly balancing conveniences and inconveniences, pronounce between the existing law of copyright and the law now proposed to us. The question of copyright, Sir, like most questions of civil prudence, is neither black nor white, but grey. The system of copyright has great advantages and great disadvantages; and it is our business to ascertain what these are, and then to make an arrangement under which the advantages may be as far as possible secured, and the disadvantages as far as possible excluded. The charge which I bring against my honorable and learned friend's bill is this, that it

leaves the advantages nearly what they are at present, and increases the disadvantages at least fourfold.

The advantages arising from a system of copyright are obvious. It is desirable that we should have a supply of good books; we cannot have such a supply unless men of letters are liberally remunerated; and the least objectionable way of remunerating them is by means of copyright. You cannot depend for literary instruction and amusement on the leisure of men occupied in the pursuits of active life. Such men may occasionally produce compositions of great merit. But you must not look to such men for works which require deep meditation and long research. Works of that kind you can expect only from persons who make literature the business of their lives. Of these persons few will be found among the rich and the noble. The rich and the noble are not impelled to intellectual exertion by necessity. They may be impelled to intellectual exertion by the desire of distinguishing themselves, or by the desire of benefiting the community. But it is generally within these walls that they seek to signalize themselves and to serve their fellow-creatures. Both their ambition and their public spirit, in a country like this, naturally take a political turn. It is then on men whose profession is literature, and whose private means are not ample, that you must rely for a supply of valuable books. Such men must be remunerated for their literary labor. And there are only two ways in which they can be remunerated. One of those ways is patronage; the other is copyright.

There have been times in which men of letters

looked, not to the public, but to the government, or to a few great men, for the reward of their exertions. It was thus in the time of Mæcenas and Pollio at Rome, of the Medici at Florence, of Louis the Fourteenth in France, of Lord Halifax and Lord Oxford in this country. Now, Sir, I well know that there are cases in which it is fit and graceful, nay, in which it is a sacred duty to reward the merits or to relieve the distresses of men of genius by the exercise of this species of liberality. But these cases are exceptions. I can conceive no system more fatal to the integrity and independence of literary men than one under which they should be taught to look for their daily bread to the favor of ministers and nobles. I can conceive no system more certain to turn those minds which are formed by nature to be the blessings and ornaments of our species into public scandals and pests.

We have, then, only one resource left. We must betake ourselves to copyright, be the inconveniences of copyright what they may. Those inconveniences, in truth, are neither few nor small. Copyright is monopoly, and produces all the effects which the general voice of mankind attributes to monopoly. My honorable and learned friend talks very contemptuously of those who are led away by the theory that monopoly makes things dear. That monopoly makes things dear is certainly a theory, as all the great truths which have been established by the experience of all ages and nations, and which are taken for granted in all reasonings, may be said to be theories. It is a theory in the same sense in which it is a theory that day and night follow each other, that lead is heavier than water, that bread

nourishes, that arsenic poisons, that alcohol intoxicates. If, as my honorable and learned friend seems to think, the whole world is in the wrong on this point, if the real effect of monopoly is to make articles good and cheap, why does he stop short in his career of change? Why does he limit the operation of so salutary a principle to sixty years? Why does he consent to anything short of a perpetuity? He told us that in consenting to anything short of a perpetuity he was making a compromise between extreme right and expediency. But if his opinion about monopoly be correct, extreme right and expediency would coincide. Or rather, why should we not restore the monopoly of the East India trade to the East India Company? Why should we not revive all those old monopolies which, in Elizabeth's reign, galled our fathers so severely that, maddened by intolerable wrong, they opposed to their sovereign a resistance before which her haughty spirit quailed for the first and for the last time? Was it the cheapness and excellence of commodities that then so violently stirred the indignation of the English people? I believe, Sir, that I may safely take it for granted that the effect of monopoly generally is to make articles scarce, to make them dear, and to make them bad. And I may with equal safety challenge my honorable friend to find out any distinction between copyright and other privileges of the same kind; any reason why a monopoly of books should produce an effect directly the reverse of that which was produced by the East India Company's monopoly of tea, or by Lord Essex's monopoly of sweet wines. Thus, then, stands the case. It is good that authors should be remunerated; and the least

exceptionable way of remunerating them is by a monopoly. Yet monopoly is an evil. For the sake of the good we must submit to the evil; but the evil ought not to last a day longer than is necessary for the purpose of securing the good.

Now, I will not affirm that the existing law is perfect, that it exactly hits the point at which the monopoly ought to cease; but this I confidently say, that the existing law is very much nearer that point than the law proposed by my honorable and learned friend. For consider this; the evil effects of the monopoly are proportioned to the length of its duration. But the good effects for the sake of which we bear with the evil effects are by no means proportioned to the length of its duration. A monopoly of sixty years produces twice as much evil as a monopoly of thirty years, and thrice as much evil as a monopoly of twenty years. But it is by no means the fact that a posthumous monopoly of sixty years gives to an author thrice as much pleasure and thrice as strong a motive as a posthumous monopoly of twenty years. On the contrary, the difference is so small as to be hardly perceptible. We all know how faintly we are affected by the prospect of very distant advantages, even when they are advantages which we may reasonably hope that we shall ourselves enjoy. But an advantage that is to be enjoyed more than half a century after we are dead, by somebody, we know not by whom, perhaps by somebody unborn, by somebody utterly unconnected with us, is really no motive at all to action. It is very probable that in the course of some generations land in the unexplored and unmapped heart of the Australasian continent will be very valuable.

But there is none of us who would lay down five pounds for a whole province in the heart of the Australasian continent. We know that neither we nor anybody for whom we care will ever receive a farthing of rent from such a province. And a man is very little moved by the thought that in the year 2000 or 2100, somebody who claims through him will employ more shepherds than Prince Esterhazy, and will have the finest house and gallery of pictures at Victoria or Sydney. Now, this is the sort of boon which my honorable and learned friend holds out to authors. Considered as a boon to them, it is a mere nullity; but, considered as an impost on the public, it is no nullity, but a very serious and pernicious reality. I will take an example. Dr. Johnson died fifty-six years ago. If the law were what my honorable and learned friend wishes to make it, somebody would now have the monopoly of Dr. Johnson's works. Who that somebody would be it is impossible to say; but we may venture to guess. I guess, then, that it would have been some bookseller, who was the assign of another bookseller, who was the grandson of a third bookseller, who had bought the copyright from Black Frank, the doctor's servant and residuary legatee, in 1785 or 1786. Now, would the knowledge that this copyright would exist in 1841 have been a source of gratification to Johnson? Would it have stimulated his exertions? Would it have once drawn him out of his bed before noon? Would it have once cheered him under a fit of the spleen? Would it have induced him to give us one more allegory, one more life of a poet, one more imitation of Juvenal? I firmly believe not. I firmly believe that a hundred years

ago, when he was writing our debates for the *Gentleman's Magazine,* he would very much rather have had two-pence to buy a plate of shin of beef at a cook's shop underground. Considered as a reward to him, the difference between a twenty years' and sixty years' term of posthumous copyright would have been nothing or next to nothing. But is the difference nothing to us? I can buy *Rasselas* for sixpence; I might have had to give five shillings for it. I can buy the Dictionary, the entire genuine Dictionary, for two guineas, perhaps for less; I might have had to give five or six guineas for it. Do I grudge this to a man like Dr. Johnson? Not at all. Show me that the prospect of this boon roused him to any vigorous effort, or sustained his spirits under depressing circumstances, and I am quite willing to pay the price of such an object, heavy as that price is. But what I do complain of is that my circumstances are to be worse, and Johnson's none the better; that I am to give five pounds for what to him was not worth a farthing.

The principle of copyright is this. It is a tax on readers for the purpose of giving a bounty to writers. The tax is an exceedingly bad one; it is a tax on one of the most innocent and most salutary of human pleasures; and never let us forget, that a tax on innocent pleasures is a premium on vicious pleasures. I admit, however, the necessity of giving a bounty to genius and learning. In order to give such a bounty, I willingly submit even to this severe and burdensome tax. Nay, I am ready to increase the tax, if it can be shown that by so doing I should proportionally increase the bounty. My complaint is, that my honorable and learned friend doubles,

triples, quadruples, the tax, and makes scarcely any perceptible addition to the bounty. Why, Sir, what is the additional amount of taxation which would have been levied on the public for Dr. Johnson's works alone, if my honorable and learned friend's bill had been the law of the land? I have not data sufficient to form an opinion. But I am confident that the taxation on his dictionary alone would have amounted to many thousands of pounds. In reckoning the whole additional sum which the holders of his copyrights would have taken out of the pockets of the public during the last half century at twenty thousand pounds, I feel satisfied that I very greatly underrate it. Now, I again say that I think it but fair that we should pay twenty thousand pounds in consideration of twenty thousand pounds worth of pleasure and encouragement received by Dr. Johnson. But I think it very hard that we should pay twenty thousand pounds for what he would not have valued at five shillings.

My honorable and learned friend dwells on the claims of the posterity of great writers. Undoubtedly, Sir, it would be very pleasing to see a descendant of Shakespeare living in opulence on the fruits of his great ancestor's genius. A house maintained in splendour by such a patrimony would be a more interesting and striking object than Blenheim is to us, or than Strathfieldsaye will be to our children. But, unhappily, it is scarcely possible that, under any system, such a thing can come to pass. My honorable and learned friend does not propose that copyright shall descend to the eldest son, or shall be bound up by irrevocable entail. It is to be merely personal property. It is therefore highly improbable

that it will descend during sixty years or half that term from parent to child. The chance is that more people than one will have an interest in it. They will in all probability sell it and divide the proceeds. The price which a bookseller will give for it will bear no proportion to the sum which he will afterwards draw from the public, if his speculation proves successful. He will give little, if anything, more for a term of sixty years than for a term of thirty or five and twenty. The present value of a distant advantage is always small; but when there is great room to doubt whether a distant advantage will be any advantage at all, the present value sinks to almost nothing. Such is the inconstancy of the public taste that no sensible man will venture to pronounce, with confidence, what the sale of any book published in our days will be in the years between 1890 and 1900. The whole fashion of thinking and writing has often undergone a change in a much shorter period than that to which my honorable and learned friend would extend posthumous copyright. What would have been considered the best literary property in the earlier part of Charles the Second's reign? I imagine Cowley's Poems. Overleap sixty years, and you are in the generation of which Pope asked, "Who now reads Cowley?" What works were ever expected with more impatience by the public than those of Lord Bolingbroke, which appeared, I think, in 1754? In 1814, no bookseller would have thanked you for the copyright of them all, if you had offered it to him for nothing. What would Paternoster Row give now for the copyright of Hayley's *Triumphs of Temper*, so much admired within the memory of many people still living?

I say, therefore, that from the very nature of literary property, it will almost always pass away from an author's family; and I say, that the price given for it to the family will bear a very small proportion to the tax which the purchaser, if his speculation turns out well, will in the course of a long series of years levy on the public.

If, Sir, I wished to find a strong and perfect illustration of the effects which I anticipate from long copyright, I should select,—my honorable and learned friend will be surprised,—I should select the case of Milton's granddaughter. As often as this bill has been under discussion, the fate of Milton's granddaughter has been brought forward by the advocates of monopoly. My honorable and learned friend has repeatedly told the story with great eloquence and effect. He has dilated on the sufferings, on the abject poverty, of this ill-fated woman, the last of an illustrious race. He tells us that, in the extremity of her distress, Garrick gave her a benefit, that Johnson wrote a prologue, and that the public contributed some hundreds of pounds. Was it fit, he asks, that she should receive, in this eleemosynary form, a small portion of what was in truth a debt? Why, he asks, instead of obtaining a pittance from charity, did she not live in comfort and luxury on the proceeds of the sale of her ancestor's works? But, Sir, will my honorable and learned friend tell me that this event, which he has so often and so pathetically described, was caused by the shortness of the term of copyright? Why, at that time, the duration of copyright was longer than even he, at present, proposes to make it. The monopoly lasted, not sixty years, but for ever. At the time at which

Milton's granddaughter asked charity, Milton's works were the exclusive property of a bookseller. Within a few months of the day on which the benefit was given at Garrick's theater, the holder of the copyright of *Paradise Lost*,—I think it was Tonson, —applied to the Court of Chancery for an injunction against a bookseller who had published a cheap edition of the great epic poem, and obtained the injunction. The representation of *Comus* was, if I remember rightly, in 1750; the injunction in 1752. Here, then, is a perfect illustration of the effect of long copyright. Milton's works are the property of a single publisher. Everybody who wants them must buy them at Tonson's shop, and at Tonson's price. Whoever attempts to undersell Tonson is harassed with legal proceedings. Thousands who would gladly possess a copy of *Paradise Lost*, must forego that great enjoyment. And what, in the meantime, is the situation of the only person for whom we can suppose that the author, protected at such a cost to the public, was at all interested? She is reduced to utter destitution. Milton's works are under a monopoly. Milton's granddaughter is starving. The reader is pillaged; but the writer's family is not enriched. Society is taxed doubly. It has to give an exorbitant price for the poems; and it has at the same time to give alms to the only surviving descendant of the poet.

But this is not all. I think it right, Sir, to call the attention of the House to an evil, which is perhaps more to be apprehended when an author's copyright remains in the hands of his family, than when it is transferred to booksellers. I seriously fear that, if such a measure as this should be adopted,

many valuable works will be either totally suppressed or grievously mutilated. I can prove that this danger is not chimerical; and I am quite certain that, if the danger be real, the safeguards which my honorable and learned friend has devised are altogether nugatory. That the danger is not chimerical may easily be shown. Most of us, I am sure, have known persons who, very erroneously as I think, but from the best motives, would not choose to reprint Fielding's novels, or Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* Some gentlemen may perhaps be of opinion that it would be as well if *Tom Jones* and Gibbon's *History* were never reprinted. I will not, then, dwell on these or similar cases. I will take cases respecting which it is not likely that there will be any difference of opinion here; cases, too, in which the danger of which I now speak is not matter of supposition, but matter of fact. Take Richardson's novels. Whatever I may, on the present occasion, think of my honorable and learned friend's judgment as a legislator, I must always respect his judgment as a critic. He will, I am sure, say that Richardson's novels are among the most valuable, among the most original works in our language. No writings have done more to raise the fame of English genius in foreign countries. No writings are more deeply pathetic. No writings, those of Shakespeare excepted, show more profound knowledge of the human heart. As to their moral tendency, I can cite the most respectable testimony. Dr. Johnson describes Richardson as one who had taught the passions to move at the command of virtue. My dear and honored friend, Mr. Wilberforce, in his celebrated re-

ligious treatise, when speaking of the unchristian tendency of the fashionable novels of the eighteenth century, distinctly excepts Richardson from the censure. Another excellent person, whom I can never mention without respect and kindness, Mrs. Hannah More, often declared in conversation, and has declared in one of her published poems, that she first learned from the writings of Richardson those principles of piety by which her life was guided. I may safely say that books celebrated as works of art through the whole civilized world, and praised for their moral tendency by Dr. Johnson, by Mr. Wilberforce, by Mrs. Hannah More, ought not to be suppressed. Sir, it is my firm belief, that if the law had been what my honorable and learned friend proposes to make it, they would have been suppressed. I remember Richardson's grandson well; he was a clergyman in the city of London; he was a most upright and excellent man; but he had conceived a strong prejudice against works of fiction. He thought all novel-reading not only frivolous but sinful. He said,—this I state on the authority of one of his clerical brethren who is now a bishop,—he said that he had never thought it right to read one of his grandfather's books. Suppose, Sir, that the law had been what my honorable and learned friend would make it. Suppose that the copyright of Richardson's novels had descended, as might well have been the case, to this gentleman. I firmly believe that he would have thought it sinful to give them a wide circulation. I firmly believe that he would not for a hundred thousand pounds have deliberately done what he thought sinful. He would not have reprinted them. And what protection does

my honorable and learned friend give to the public in such a case? Why, Sir, what he proposes is this: if a book is not reprinted during five years, any person who wishes to reprint it may give notice in the *London Gazette:* the advertisement must be repeated three times: a year must elapse; and then, if the proprietor of the copyright does not put forth a new edition, he loses his exclusive privilege. Now, what protection is this to the public? What is a new edition? Does the law define the number of copies that make an edition? Does it limit the price of a copy? Are twelve copies on large paper, charged at thirty guineas each, an edition? It has been usual, when monopolies have been granted, to prescribe numbers and to limit prices. But I do not find that my honorable and learned friend proposes to do so in the present case. And, without some such provision, the security which he offers is manifestly illusory. It is my conviction that, under such a system as that which he recommends to us, a copy of *Clarissa* would have been as rare as an Aldus or a Caxton.

I will give another instance. One of the most instructive, interesting and delightful books in our language is Boswell's *Life of Johnson.* Now it is well known that Boswell's eldest son considered this book, considered the whole relation of Boswell to Johnson, as a blot in the escutcheon of the family. He thought, not perhaps altogether without reason, that his father had exhibited himself in a ludicrous and degrading light. And thus he became so sore and irritable that at last he could not bear to hear the *Life of Johnson* mentioned. Suppose that the law had been what my honorable and learned

friend wishes to make it. Suppose that the copyright of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* had belonged, as it well might, during sixty years, to Boswell's eldest son. What would have been the consequence? An unadulterated copy of the finest biographical work in the world would have been as scarce as the first edition of Camden's *Britannia*.

These are strong cases. I have shown you that, if the law had been what you are now going to make it, the finest prose work of fiction in the language, the finest biographical work in the language, would very probably have been suppressed. But I have stated my case weakly. The books which I have mentioned are singularly inoffensive books, books not touching on any of those questions which drive even wise men beyond the bounds of wisdom. There are books of a very different kind, books which are the rallying points of great political and religious parties. What is likely to happen if the copyright of one of these books should by descent or transfer come into the possession of some hostile zealot? I will take a single instance. It is only fifty years since John Wesley died; and all his works, if the law had been what my honorable and learned friend wishes to make it, would now have been the property of some person or other. The sect founded by Wesley is the most numerous, the wealthiest, the most powerful, the most zealous of sects. In every parliamentary election it is a matter of the greatest importance to obtain the support of the Wesleyan Methodists. Their numerical strength is reckoned by hundreds of thousands. They hold the memory of their founder in the greatest reverence; and not without reason, for he

was unquestionably a great and good man. To his authority they constantly appeal. His works are in their eyes of the highest value. His doctrinal writings they regard as containing the best system of theology ever deduced from Scripture. His journals, interesting even to the common reader, are peculiarly interesting to the Methodist; for they contain the whole history of that singular polity which, weak and despised in its beginning, is now, after the lapse of a century, so strong, so flourishing, and so formidable. The hymns to which he gave his imprimatur are a most important part of the public worship of his followers. Now, suppose that the copyright of these works should belong to some person who holds the memory of Wesley and the doctrines and discipline of the Methodists in abhorrence. There are many such persons. The Ecclesiastical Courts are at this very time sitting on the case of a clergyman of the Established Church who refused Christian burial to a child baptised by a Methodist preacher. I took up the other day a work which is considered as among the most respectable organs of a large and growing party in the Church of England, and there I saw John Wesley designated as a forsworn priest. Suppose that the works of Wesley were suppressed. Why, Sir, such a grievance would be enough to shake the foundations of government. Let gentlemen who are attached to the church reflect for a moment what their feelings would be if the Book of Common Prayer were not to be reprinted for thirty or forty years, if the price of a Book of Common Prayer were run up to five or ten guineas. And then let them determine whether they will pass a law under which it is

possible, under which it is probable, that so intolerable a wrong may be done to some sect consisting perhaps of half a million of persons.

I am so sensible, Sir, of the kindness with which the House has listened to me, that I will not detain you longer. I will only say this, that if the measure before us should pass, and should produce one-tenth part of the evil which it is calculated to produce, and which I fully expect it to produce, there will soon be a remedy, though of a very objectionable kind. Just as the absurd Acts which prohibited the sale of game were virtually repealed by the poacher, just as many absurd revenue Acts have been virtually repealed by the smuggler, so will this law be virtually repealed by piratical booksellers. At present the holder of copyright has the public feeling on his side. Those who invade copyright are regarded as knaves who take the bread out of the mouths of deserving men. Everybody is well pleased to see them restrained by the law, and compelled to refund their ill-gotten gains. No tradesman of good repute will have anything to do with such disgraceful transactions. Pass this law: and that feeling is at an end. Men very different from the present race of piratical booksellers will soon infringe this intolerable monopoly. Great masses of capital will be constantly employed in the violation of the law. Every art will be employed to evade legal pursuit; and the whole nation will be in the plot. On which side indeed should the public sympathy be when the question is whether some book as popular as *Robinson Crusoe,* or the *Pilgrim's Progress,* shall be in every cottage, or whether it shall be confined to the libraries of the rich for the advantage of the

great-grandson of a bookseller who, a hundred years before, drove a hard bargain for the copyright with the author when in great distress? Remember too that, when once it ceases to be considered as wrong and discreditable to invade literary property, no person can say where the invasion will stop. The public seldom makes nice distinctions. The wholesome copyright which now exists will share in the disgrace and danger of the new copyright which you are about to create. And you will find that, in attempting to impose unreasonable restraints on the reprinting of the works of the dead, you have, to a great extent, annulled those restraints which now prevent men from pillaging and defrauding the living. If I saw, Sir, any probability that this bill could be so amended in the committee that my objections might be removed, I would not divide the House in this stage. But I am so fully convinced that no alteration which would not seem insupportable to my honorable and learned friend, could render his measure supportable to me, that I must move, though with regret, that this bill be read a second time this day six months.

NOTES

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

FAREWELL ADDRESS.

AUTHORSHIP.

The first draft of most of Washington's state papers was prepared by others. The papers were not, however, given out until revised, well considered, digested, and rewritten by Washington himself. In 1792, Madison, at Washington's request, furnished him a draft of an address to the American people on Washington's expected retirement. Having been prevailed upon to accept a second term, Washington did not again take up the project of a farewell address until 1796. The address was dated September 17, 1796, and contains some suggestions from Madison's former draft and some from Hamilton. "The copy from which the final draft was printed . . . is wholly in the handwriting of Washington. It bears all the marks of a most rigid and laborious revision." Sparks: *Writings of Washington*, Vol. XII, appendix.

THE OCCASION AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES.

What is excellent in literature is preserved because of the universal element of truth and the evidence of great personality in it. Even though utterly ignorant of the historical facts back of Washington's Farewell Address and unacquainted with the life of Washington, a reader could not miss the appeal of the great national principles which the address embodies; nor could he escape the feeling that he is in the presence of a great and admirable personality. A knowledge of the facts and of the life, however, would greatly deepen appreciation. Recall in connection with the introduction of the address (p. 35—p. 38, l. 15) the great debt of gratitude which the country owed to Washington for his services in the Revolution. Recall the fact that he was probably the only American who could have gotten the new government under way amid the perplexities that arose after the dismal failure of the old Confederation. Recall the bitter

and unjust criticism of his administration and of himself. And then note the spirit of good-will, concern for the public welfare, and dignified modesty where much personal credit might have been claimed. The first topic of the discussion (p. 38, l. 16—p. 41, l. 27) enjoins love of country, pride in the national union. There were still a great many Americans who remained in the colonial condition of mind, who took their politics from abroad, and thought politically as Frenchmen or as Englishmen rather than as Americans. There was also considerable unfriendliness and jealousy between North and South, East and West,—a feeling that appears to this day on occasion, usually showing itself in connection with tariff bills, or discussions of the money question, or the bank question. The logic of Washington's first topic will be keenly felt by the student who is informed about the attitude of different sections of our country towards the Assumption Bill, the National Bank, the Excise Bill, the Whiskey Insurrection, the Genet Affair, the Jay Treaty, the Spanish Treaty, the Proclamation of Neutrality. (See any of the larger histories: Hildreth, volumes III-V; Schouler, volume I; Sparks, *Life and Writings of Washington,* or the volumes in the American Statesmen Series on Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, and Jay.) That the warning was timely will be clear to those who recall the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, and the rumors of secession in connection with these and with the Hartford Convention sixteen years later. Washington next takes up more specifically (p. 41, l. 28—p. 45, l. 3) the danger to the Union arising from political parties based on geographical lines, and here refers by name to the treaties with Spain and England, thereby recalling the agitation, based on sectional lines and on foreign affiliations, that was aroused by the proposal of these treaties. (See Lodge: *George Washington,* vol. II, pp. 135, 167, 180, 201, 205.) He next emphasizes the need of an adequate central government (p. 42, l. 26) and of obedience to it (p. 43, l. 9), warning against combinations and factions (p. 43, l. 19) and against the spirit of innovation. (Lodge: *Washington,* II, 266-268.) The discussion of party spirit (p. 45, l. 4—p. 46, l. 23) recalls the fact that Washington entered upon the Presidency with the impossible expectation that parties could be eliminated from government. His cabinet, however, represented in Hamilton and Jefferson respectively, the two principles along which parties speedily formed. (Alexander Johnston: *American Politics.*) The Farewell Address is to be read as his final judgment that parties are inevitable, but excessive party spirit is forever to be repressed in a free country. (See chapter V, vol. II of Lodge's biography, on "Washington as a Party Man.") It

is a corollary of this that a party when in power should proceed with moderation and not in a spirit of vengeance, and should keep well within constitutional limitations (p. 46, l. 24—p. 47, l. 17). The next section of the address (p. 47, l. 18—p. 48, l. 12) should recall the words of the Ordinance of 1787. On public credit and acquiescence in revenue laws (p. 48, l. 13—p. 49, l. 4), the experience of Washington's administration with Hamilton's financial measures and with the Whiskey Insurrection, plainly speaks. (See Lodge: *Washington*, II, 122-128). The last topic of the discussion (p. 49, l. 5—p. 55, l. 7) deals with the principles that should govern our country's foreign policy. The inveterate antipathy against England and the passionate attachment for France are alike condemned (p. 49, l. 22), though the countries are not named. Pages 50 and 51 recall the Genet Affair, with the attendant exhibitions of foolish popular affection for France and equally foolish popular hatred for England; and the disgraceful intriguing of one American faction with the French minister to the United States. (See Lodge: *Washington*, II, chapter IV.) The great rule of conduct (p. 51, ll. 24-28) in foreign affairs, as laid down by Washington, was nobly fulfilled in the diplomacy of the late John Hay, Secretary of State. In closing with a defense of the Proclamation of Neutrality, Washington reached a true climax, a fact not generally appreciated today; for that proclamation embodied, in effect, all the fundamental principles laid down in the Farewell Address. It meant national solidarity against the world, as opposed to a divided nation with conflicting sympathies running wildly in favor of one foreign country or another. The conclusion (p. 55, ll. 8-30) like the introduction, illustrates the highest use of personal reference. But the evidence of great and admirable personality is found not merely in the sentiments of the introduction and the conclusion. It appears in the magnanimous and perfectly adequate treatment of the principles announced one after another in the body of the discourse; in the final character and nobility of those principles; in the repression of the controversial spirit and the choice of the highest plane of discussion. If the address had been written in the spirit of controversy, it must have remained on the low plane of fact; it comes to us not on that plane, but on the plane of truth. The next speech in this volume, Webster on the Character of Washington, contains an exposition of the main truths of the Farewell Address.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES.

Make a complete outline of the address, following the form of the outline of Webster's Bunker Hill Monument Address as given in the introduction to this volume (p. 24). Are the

topics of the address related to one another by the law of cause and effect, or by similarity and contrast, or by contiguity? What passages or maxims would you select for memorizing? What audience is Washington addressing? Do you find the appeal to community of interest anywhere plainly expressed? Does the persuasion arise from the subject, the method of treatment, or the speaker? What does Washington mean by the distinction between *political* and *commercial* in our dealings with foreign nations? Is there any ground for thinking that the principles of the address are in any respect obsolete? On the immediate effect of the Farewell Address, see Lodge's *Washington*, volume II, pages 248-251.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

THE CHARACTER OF WASHINGTON.

THE SPEAKER.

When this speech was delivered, in 1832, Webster had been United States Senator from Massachusetts about five years, and had previously served several terms in the House of Representatives. He had already enjoyed five great triumphs. As a lawyer he had won a favorable decision from the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dartmouth College Case; he had gained fame also by four remarkable orations: one commemorating the landing of the Pilgrims, one at the laying of the corner stone of the Bunker Hill Monument, one on Adams and Jefferson, and one in reply to Hayne. These had made Webster recognized as the leader of the Union sentiment, the national idea, in the country, just as Senators Calhoun and Hayne were already the recognized leaders of the confederation sentiment in the country, of the idea that the Constitution is merely a compact. Although he served twice as Secretary of State and was twice a candidate for the presidency, it was in the Senate, as the expounder of the Constitution on the national theory, that he performed his greatest service. His last great speech, March 7, 1850, was on the slavery question. He died in 1852 at the age of seventy. See Lodge: *Daniel Webster* (American Statesmen Series), especially chapter IV; Curtis: *Life of Webster*, especially chapter XI; Whipple: *Essays and Reviews*, Vol. I; Whipple: *Webster's Great Speeches*.

KIND OF ADDRESS.

An address which takes for its title the name of a great man may (1) be merely narrative and biographical. This it is

likely to be, and needs to be, if the man whom it celebrates has but recently passed away, or if, though long celebrated, his life in many of its details has been forgotten. (2) It may be judicial, aiming at a careful estimate of the worth of the life and of its influence. (3) It may be appreciative and eulogistic, dealing not with the facts of the life but with the exemplary principles which guided the great man in his work. (4) It may take the life and the principles which governed it merely as a point of departure for discussion of present day problems and duties and of the spirit in which they should be met. In these days a Washington's Birthday address is likely to be of the type last named. Webster's address is not judicial and is only incidentally biographical. It is in the main an appreciation of Washington's character, and the appreciation is deepest when Webster speaks of Washington's devotion to the paramount idea of Union, to the country as one nation (pp. 69-71); for this was the idea to which Webster himself was supremely devoted during his whole life.

THE THEME.

The subject of this address is Washington; the theme, everywhere present, is the spirit of American Nationality as exemplified in Washington. The sentiment of nationalism, of an inseparable unity of states, of a supreme union as an essential of true liberty, was still not dominant in this country. Webster had given it a commanding utterance two years before in the Reply to Hayne. Now he recurs to it. At the opening of the speech (p. 56, ll. 9-11; p. 57, ll. 8, 21; p. 58, ll. 1-11) it is calmly assumed. In the body of the discourse, which begins on page 58, line 22, it is appealed to incidentally as the key to the proper appreciation of Washington's character (p. 60, ll. 3, 4, 14, 15; p. 61, l. 19; p. 62, ll. 12-17; p. 63, l. 9; p. 64, ll. 5-15; p. 65, ll. 12, 16-25 [referring to the Proclamation of Neutrality], 32; p. 66, ll. 10, 11; p. 67, ll. 1, 10, 14, 32; p. 81, l. 23), but finally (pp. 69-73) the sentiment of nationalism becomes the main object of the discussion. Thus the various topics of the address (beginning respectively on pages 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68 and 69) are bound together by this pervading sentiment.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES.

Make an outline of the address. This address abounds in specimens of the climax; almost every one of the longer paragraphs affords a specimen. Note how each climax is approached. Webster does not often in his speeches use ex-

tended figures, but in this address such figures are numerous. See p. 57, ll. 9-12, ll. 26-32. Also see p. 58, ll. 17-21 (perhaps the finest of all), p. 64, l. 26; p. 69, l. 13; p. 71, ll. 22-30; p. 72, ll. 8-19. On p. 64, ll. 20-22, Webster adapts Goldsmith's lines referring to Burke:

"Who, born for the universe, narrowed his mind,
And to party gave up what was meant for mankind."
—Goldsmith: *Retaliation*, 31.

Note the large use of rhetorical questions in this address. Whence arises the persuasive element in the address, from the subject, from the method or from the speaker?

THE BUNKER HILL MONUMENT.

THE OCCASION.

A monument to General Warren, whom Webster calls "the first great martyr" of the revolution, had been erected by King Solomon's Lodge of Masons, Charlestown, Massachusetts, and had been dedicated, in 1794. General Warren in his lifetime had been Grand Master of the Massachusetts Masons. But there came in the course of years a desire on the part of Congress, the Massachusetts legislature, and the people generally, for a grander memorial not only to Warren but also to the other patriots who had fought at Bunker Hill. An association, the Bunker Hill Monument Association, was formed, with Webster as President of the Board of Trustees. Funds were raised and on June 17, 1825, the ceremonies of laying the corner stone took place. The procession included the military, followed by two hundred veterans of the Revolution, in carriages, forty of the veterans being survivors of the battle of Bunker Hill. Then came the members of the Monument Association and of the Masonic fraternity, followed by Lafayette, who had arranged his progress through the country so as to be present on the occasion. Many civic societies followed and the procession was attended with great enthusiasm and a universal outburst of patriotism during its long progress from the State House to Breed's Hill. Thousands had come to hear the great Webster, whom the trustees of the Association had appointed orator. For this extraordinary occasion, Webster had made preparations that were unusual for him. He had written out the speech in full, whereas it was his custom to write out and commit to memory only the most important and striking passages of his speeches. It is known that this speech caused Webster great anxiety; especially, the portion to be addressed directly to the noble Lafayette raised

fine questions of taste, fitness, and proportion, that were not so urgent in the case of the direct address to the Revolutionary soldiers. "He said," says Ticknor, "that he felt as if he knew how to talk to such men, for that his father, and many of his father's friends whom he had known, had been among them."

QUALITIES OF THE ADDRESS.

Five years before the date of this address Webster had given at Plymouth the oration celebrating the "First Settlement of New England," which Ticknor described as "a series of eloquent fragments." In that oration Webster had touched upon the power of local association, the historical event, the character of the Pilgrims, the growth and future of the country, on liberty, on the national view of the constitution, on education and on slavery. The point of Ticknor's description is that these topics were not so closely knit together as to make an organized unity. No such criticism could be passed on the Monument speech. Although the range of topics is even greater than in the Plymouth Oration, and consequently the problem of relating them closely to one another is more difficult, unity of organization is effected with apparent ease. (See outline and study of the principles of arrangement, Introduction, pp. 24-28.) Many of the ideas are the same in the two orations; for instance the idea of the power of local association (p. 74, l. 9. See also p. 56, l. 23), of the growth of mankind in education (p. 89) and in government (pp. 93-94). Besides unity and wide range of topics, the Monument Address shows ease of transition; its continuity is unbroken. In making transitions Webster uses the "echo" frequently,—some word or sentiment towards the end of one paragraph being repeated at the beginning of the next (e. g. "deep impression," p. 74, l. 7, is echoed in "affect" and "emotions," ll. 10, 11). This is a special form of the arrangement by contiguity (see p. 24). Note also the easy approach to the address to the survivors (p. 80, l. 19), to the veterans (p. 82, l. 20) and to Lafayette (p. 87, l. 26). Another quality conspicuous in all of Webster's orations is massiveness; there is a sufficient bulk of material gathered about each point to give it due importance and dignity; a sense of satisfaction is experienced as the discussion of each topic is concluded. The language is plain and direct; almost devoid of subtlety and fancy (the one fanciful allusion in this speech is to the ships about the Charlestown navy yard, p. 81, l. 11). Yet there is imagination (e. g. p. 75, ll. 8-23). There is picturesqueness (e. g. p. 79). There is force. These are higher qualities, independent of vocabulary and of sentence-

length; they are qualities that arise from the vision or insight of the speaker into the deeper significance of the occasion (cf. pp. 75, 78, 81, 88, 89, 91, 93). The sentences are short and clear; they are void of monotony on account of the fullness and variety of thought which they carry. It is Webster's simplicity of expression, combined with the amplitude of his thought and the dignity of his emotion, that explains the power of his speech. It was this that led those who listened to him to speak of his discourse as having "magnanimity," or "high seriousness," or "largeness," or "sweep," or "elevation," or "tone." These words point to characteristics of the speaker's personality while, at the same time, they describe his speech; thus they indicate his sincerity and perfect competence for the occasion. (Other points are touched upon in the Introduction, pp. 24-31). Webster's speeches are full of political wisdom and the Monument Address is no exception. (See especially pp. 89, 92.) Our attention is held by his thoughts, rather than by the way in which they are clothed. He makes no effort for small adornment; quotations and literary allusions are few. That on p. 81, l. 34, is from *Milton's Paradise Lost*, V, 310-311; that on p. 85, l. 29, is from Virgil's *Æneid*, VI, 726 ("infused through all parts, intelligence moves the whole mass and permeates the great body"); that on p. 89, l. 4 is from Horace's *Carmina*, I. 2, 45 ("May you return late to heaven; may you live long!"); that on p. 94, l. 18 is from Homer's *Iliad*, XVIII; books that Webster read in the academy and in college and that continued to be his favorites through life. From the nature of the case, historical references are numerous. The matters with which they deal, colonial history, the French Revolution, the Greek Revolution, South American States, are treated at length in the larger histories, Fiske, Bancroft, Von Holst, Lalor's *Cyclopedia of United States History*, or may be traced by use of the index volume of the American Statesmen Series. On page 95, ll. 20-26 the reference is to the events that followed the Greek War against Turkey, for independence (1821-1829). In 1830, the great powers declared Greece an independent kingdom, Turkey agreeing; but they were unable to provide a king for Greece until 1832. Meanwhile Greece was ruled by a dictator and conditions were so bad as to justify the alternatives mentioned, ll. 5-9. As would be expected, melody and cadence on the small scale of single sentences, are not prominent characteristics of Webster, but in the larger divisions of his discourse, rhythm and harmony are prominent. They arise from the large sweep of his thought and emotion, and are best noticed as he approaches and reaches his climaxes (pp. 78, 83, 97 and 99).

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

AT COOPER INSTITUTE.

February 27, 1860.

THE SPEAKER.

By the time this speech was delivered Abraham Lincoln had become a national Republican leader. The East had followed with interest the course of the Illinois senatorial campaign of 1858, which had resulted in returning Douglas to the Senate but had placed Lincoln, the defeated candidate, in a position equal to Seward as spokesman of the new party. The chief facts of Lincoln's early life had now been printed many times in the newspapers of eastern cities—the hardships of his boyhood, his experiences as the son of a pioneer, his efforts at educating himself, his career as an Illinois lawyer, and his connection with the Blackhawk War. It was recalled that he had served in the Illinois legislature (1834-37) and had been one term in Congress (1846-48), where he had voted repeatedly ("about forty-two times," he humorously said) in favor of the Wilmot Proviso, which proposed to prohibit slavery in all territory acquired of Mexico. He had campaigned against Douglas after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854, and had been elected to the legislature in that year, but had resigned immediately in order to become the anti-Nebraska candidate for the United States Senate against Senator Shields. In the course of the balloting he had lost votes steadily on account of the fact that the Abolitionists gave him ardent support and so he had withdrawn from the contest urging his friends to support Judge Trumbull, an anti-Nebraska Democrat, who was elected. In 1858 he had been the Republican candidate for the Senate against Senator Douglas, and had engaged Douglas in that remarkable series of debates which, as Blaine says, "effected the organization of parties and changed the fate of millions." His reputation as a speaker had preceded him to New York. He was known to be plain and awkward, even grotesque, in appearance; quaint and humorous, but relentlessly logical and analytical in his method of argument; in his illustrations, homely and effective; in temper, honest and sincere, but also sagacious and practical.

THE OCCASION.

The invitation to New York City was gladly accepted by Lincoln. "That the anti-slavery men of that city wished to test him by personal observation," says Morse, "signified

that his reputation was national, and that the highest aspirations were, therefore, not altogether presumptuous.'' He wished to try his powers upon an Eastern audience, presumably more critical and exacting than the audiences which he had faced in the West. Probably Lincoln's natural embarrassment in the circumstances was not diminished when the chairman of the meeting, William Cullen Bryant, introduced him simply as ''an eminent citizen of the West, hitherto known to you only by reputation.'' However, speaker and audience were soon at one as the masterly argument developed. During the preceding four months Lincoln had prepared this address with the utmost care. Probably no other speech in his life had cost him so much labor. The New York *Tribune* said that ''No man ever before made such an impression upon a New York audience'' and ''Since the days of Clay and Webster no man has spoken to a larger assemblage of the intellect and culture of the city.'' Horace Greeley considered Lincoln's address a masterpiece of persuasion: ''As an effort to convince the largest possible number that they ought to be on the speaker's side, not on the other, I do not hesitate to pronounce it unsurpassed.''

QUALITIES OF THE ADDRESS.

Lincoln's mastery of logical reasoning and persuasion gives to the address its chief characteristic. He first reads his text—the quotation from Douglas—then defines his terms, and states the issue (pp. 100-101); then (pp. 101-112) he analyzes all of the votes of all of the ''fathers'' to prove that the Republicans occupy the same position as the ''fathers'' in regard to slavery in the territories. (It is said to have taken the *Tribune* editors three weeks to verify the statements of fact in the address; so thorough had been Lincoln's research.) The best example of Lincoln's keenness of reasoning and precision of inference is his interpretation of the significance of the votes of the two ''fathers'' who voted against Congressional prohibition (p. 107) and of the probable views of the remaining sixteen ''fathers'' who did not put themselves directly on record (pp. 107-108). Leaving strict documentary evidence behind, Lincoln next addresses the Southern people (112-122). Really he is persuading Northern people who are inclined to the Southern view. By showing the true philosophical meaning of the term ''sectional party'' (p. 113), he makes Washington's warning against sectional parties (p. 115) count against his opponents and in favor of the Republicans. By harking back to the ''fathers'' he shows that the Republicans are the true conservatives and the Democrats ''innovators'' (p. 115).

His discussion of slave insurrections (pp. 116-120) absolves the Republicans of responsibility, and clears them of the charge of "abolitionism." His most difficult obstacle—the Dred Scott decision—he meets by first admitting that the Supreme Court has decided for his opponents "*in a sort of way*" (p. 121), and then proceeds to re-argue the case, maintaining that the decision was based upon a mistake of the judges and would probably be reversed by the court itself. Finally (123-125) he utilizes the widespread fear of the North that nothing less than the complete nationalization of slavery will satisfy the South. Thus the last half of the speech is firmly grounded upon the doctrines of the "fathers" as established by the first half (pp. 101-112) and as the speech broadens out in scope and interest to take in all of the issues between the Republicans and their opponents we feel the relation of these to the one fundamental principle—that the Federal government should control as to slavery in our Federal territories.

Another characteristic of this speech is precision of statement. Every sentence is not only immediately intelligible but is made to say no more and no less than the speaker intends. For instance, the fundamental principle, just referred to, had evidently been worked over until it had found a final satisfactory statement; for it is repeated in its precise words no less than fifteen times in the first half of the speech. Lincoln understood the rhetorical value of repetition in exact terms. In this speech he also repeated Douglas's sentence several times. "Our fathers, when they framed the government under which we live, understood this question just as well [as], and even better, than we do now." How careful Lincoln was to prevent misunderstanding of his precise meaning is evident from the passages beginning on page 111, line 11, and extending to page 112, line 14, and page 119, lines 13 to 21. His assurance to the South that Republicans protest against "any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves" (p. 117, line 19), is complete, specific, and logically covers the possibilities of the case. It is to be noticed also that Lincoln is precise and simple in vocabulary at the same time. Precision is often joined with technical or subtle vocabulary. Lincoln makes common words carry his precise meaning. It is logical power united with precise and simple phrasing that enables Lincoln to put his opponents so often in an uncomfortable dilemma. Thus, page 103, lines 15-18; page 104, lines 15-20; page 106, lines 26-31; page 110, lines 7-17; page 111, line 23, to page 112, line 14; page 113, lines 17-26, and page 114, lines 1-19; page 116, lines 20-33; page 120, lines 16-23; page 120, line 24, to page 121, line 11; page 123, lines 3-21; page 125, lines 28-33; page 126, lines 12-32.

The persuasiveness of the address arises from the moral earnestness of the speaker and the fairness of every proposition which he states. He is intellectually and logically honest with his historical evidence, with his opponents and with himself. See page 108, line 17; page 119, lines 1-4; page 120, lines 26-27; page 121, lines 12-17; page 125, lines 12-14; page 126, lines 6-7.

The address is devoid of anecdote, and witticism, and almost devoid of figures of speech. All of the references were doubtless understood at that time when the slavery question was the theme of discussion wherever two people met. For John Brown and Harper's Ferry, the Southampton Insurrection, the Revolution in Hayti under Toussaint L'Ouverture, the Gunpowder Plot and Guy Fawkes, Orsini and Napoleon III, Hinton R. Helper's "The Impending Crisis in the South," consult Lalor and Mason's Cyclopedia of United States History, the index volume of the American Statesmen series, or any good encyclopedia.

BRIEF OF LINCOLN'S ADDRESS AT COOPER INSTITUTE.

INTRODUCTION.

A. Senator Douglas and I agree that

> "Our fathers, when they framed the government under which we live, understood this question just as well [as], and even better, than we do now." (100)

B. Definitions—

I. "The government under which we live" is the Constitution of the United States framed in 1787, and twelve amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789. (100)

II. "Our fathers" were the thirty-nine who signed the original Constitution. (101)

III. "This question" is—
Does the proper division of local from Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution, forbid our Federal government to control as to slavery in our Federal Territories? (101)

C. The Issue—

I. Senator Douglas maintains the affirmative of "this question." (101)

II. The Republicans maintain the negative of "this question." (101)

BRIEF PROPER.

Proposition: The Republican position on this question is the correct position. Because—

A. As to the original Constitution "the Fathers" answered "this question" as the Republicans answer it. For

I. Three of the four "Fathers" who were in the Congress of the Confederation in 1784 voted in favor of prohibiting slavery in the Northwest Territory; whereas only one of the four voted against it. (101)

II. The only two "Fathers" who were in the Congress of the Confederation in 1787 voted in favor of the Ordinance of 1787 which prohibited slavery in the Northwest Territory. (102)

III. In the Convention which framed the Federal Constitution, the question of Federal control of slavery in the Territories did not come up. (102)

IV. In the first Congress (1789), sixteen of the "Fathers" being members, a bill to enforce the Ordinance of 1787, including prohibition of slavery, passed without a dissenting vote, and George Washington, another of the thirty-nine "Fathers," then President, signed the bill. (103)

V. While Congress accepted the North Carolina cession of Tennessee and the Georgia cession of Mississippi and Alabama with a condition not to prohibit slavery in the ceded territories, Congress did interfere with slavery even there. (103) For

a. In 1798, on organizing the Territory of Mississippi, Congress, without dissenting vote (three of the "Fathers" being members), prohibited the bringing of slaves into the Territory from any place without the United States. (104)

VI. In 1804, on organizing the Territory of Louisiana, Congress, without dissenting vote (two of the "Fathers" being members), interfered with—took control of—slavery. (104) For

a. They provided that no slave should be imported into the Territory from foreign parts. (105)

b. They provided that no slave should be carried into it if imported since May 1, 1798. (105)

c. They provided that no slave should be carried into it except by the owner for his own use as a settler. (105)

VII. In 1819-20, on the Missouri question, one of the two "Fathers" who were members voted against slavery prohibition and against all compromises; the other

for slavery prohibition and against all compromises. (105)

VIII. Of the thirty-nine Fathers sixteen are not shown to have acted in any way, and twenty-one voted in such a way as to be guilty of perjury if in their understanding any proper division between local and Federal authority or anything in the Constitution forbade the Federal government to control as to slavery in the territories. (106)

IX. The only two who voted against Congressional prohibition of slavery in the territories cannot certainly be said to have done so because in their understanding any proper division of local from Federal authority or anything in the Constitution forbade the Federal government to control as to slavery in the territories. (107) For

a. Their reasons for voting as they did are not known. (107)

b. They may have voted as they did on grounds of expediency. (107)

X. There is reason to believe that the remaining sixteen Fathers whose understanding of the question of Federal control of slavery in the territories is not known did not differ in understanding from the other twenty-three. (107) For

a. On other phases of the slavery question several of the sixteen were known to hold anti-slavery views, while not one is known to have held otherwise, except possibly Rutledge, of South Carolina. (108)

B. As to the amendments, especially the fifth and the tenth, "The Fathers" answered "this question" as the Republicans answered it. For

I. These amendments were framed by the very same men (including sixteen of the "Fathers") and at the very same session as that which passed the act enforcing the Ordinance of 1787. (109)

II. It is absurd to affirm that the two things which Congress did at the same time were absolutely inconsistent and were known by Congress to be inconsistent. (110)

III. I defy anyone to show that any of the Fathers during his lifetime or any living man in the world prior to 1800 ever declared that any proper division of local from Federal authority or any part of the Constitution forbade the Federal government to control as to slavery in the territories. (110)

C. The Republicans ask only that slavery be treated as the Fathers treated it. (112) For
   I. They wish it to be marked as an evil not to be extended. (112)
   II. They wish it to be marked as an evil to be tolerated only so far as necessity requires. (112)

D. Refutation. The Southern people are unjust to us Republicans. (112) For
   I. They condemn us without giving us a hearing. (113)
   II. Their charge that we are sectional is untrue. (113) For
      a. The fact that we get no votes in the South does not prove us sectional. For
         1. If it did, we should cease to be sectional as soon as we get Southern votes.
         2. That fact is of their own making. (113)
      b. To prove the charge you must prove that our principle, if put in practice, would wrong the South. (114) For
         1. If you do not, you are condemning the Fathers. (114) For
            (a) They indorsed our principle repeatedly. (114)
      c. Washington's warning against sectional parties is a weapon in our hands against the South. (115) For
         1. Washington signed an Act enforcing slavery prohibition in the Northwest Territory. (114)
         2. Washington hoped that some time we should have a confederacy of free states. (114)
         3. Washington would now blame those who repudiate his policy, not us who sustain it. (115)
   III. The Southern claim that they are conservative and that we are revolutionary is untrue. (115) For
      a. We stand for the policy of the Fathers on slavery-restriction, while they unanimously reject it. (115)
      b. They advocate innovations. (115) For
         1. Some of them would revive the foreign slave-trade.
         2. Some of them favor a congressional slave-code for the territories.
         3. Some of them favor a congressional prohibition on the territories to prevent their forbidding slavery.
         4. Some of them favor maintaining slavery in the territories through the judiciary.

5. Some of them favor maintaining popular sovereignty territories.

IV. The Southern claim that we have made the slavery question more prominent is untrue. (116) For
a. It is they who have made the slavery question more prominent. For
1. They discarded the old policy of the Fathers as to slavery.

V. The Southern charge that we are responsible for slave insurrections is untrue. (116) For
a. They have failed to implicate a single Republican in John Brown's Raid. (116)
b. Our doctrines and declarations do not lead to slave insurrections. (117) For
1. We hold no doctrines that were not held by the Fathers.
2. We continually protest against interference with slaves or with the South about its slaves.
3. Though we declare as the Fathers did that slavery is wrong, the slaves never hear us. (117)
c. Slave insurrections are no more common now than they were before the Republican Party was organized. (118) For
1. The Southampton insurrection occurred twenty-eight years ago.
d. An extensive slave insurrection will be impossible for a long time. (118) For
1. The slaves lack means of communication over wide areas.
2. Any slave plot would be betrayed by some slave in order to save the life of a favorite master or mistress. For
(a) The insurrection in Hayti was not an exception to this rule.
(b) The gunpowder plot in England was betrayed in an analogous way.
e. We advocate measures that would make slave insurrections absolutely impossible. (119) For
1. We agree with Jefferson that each slave state should provide for gradual emancipation and deportation of its own slaves.
2. We advocate congressional action restraining slavery from admission to territory where it does not now exist.
f. John Brown's raid was not a slave insurrection. (119) For
1. The slaves refused to participate in it.

2. It was the act of an enthusiast, like Orsini's attempt on Louis Napoleon.

VI. The South would gain nothing by breaking up the Republican Party. (120) For

a. You cannot change human nature.

b. You cannot eradicate the judgment and feeling that created the Republican party.

c. You would only force anti-slavery sentiment to express itself in other channels than the peaceful channel of the ballot box.

E. Refutation. The threat of the South to break up the Union rather than submit to a denial of constitutional rights is an attempt to rule or ruin. (120) For

I. The Republicans are not proposing to deprive the South of any constitutional right. (120) For

a. Republicans hold that there is no right, expressed or implied to take slaves into the Federal territories and to hold them there as property. (121)

II. The Dred Scott decision is not finally conclusive. (121) For

a. The statement on which it is based, that "the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution" is untrue. (121) For

1. The word "slave" or "slavery" is not found in the constitution. (122)

2. The word "property," referring to "slave" or "slavery," is not found in the Constitution. (122)

3. The Constitution refers to a slave only as a "person." (122)

4. The Constitution refers to slavery only as "service or labor which may be due." (122)

5. The makers of the Constitution employed euphemistic expressions for "slave" and "slavery" in order to exclude the idea that there could be property in man. For

(a) Contemporaneous history proves this.

b. The decision will probably be reconsidered. (122)

c. The Fathers unanimously decided this same constitutional question in favor of the Republican position long ago. (122)

III. To threaten disruption of the Union if a Republican should be elected President, is the threat of the highway robber.

F. Southern demands are utterly unreasonable. (123) For

I. Unconditional surrender of the territories to slavery will not satisfy the South. (123) For
   a. The South has gone beyond that: the rage now is "invasions and insurrections."
II. The purpose of the Republicans to let the South alone will not satisfy the South. (124) For
   a. We have protested that this is our purpose from the beginning.
III. The South demands that we cease to call slavery wrong, and call it right. (124) For
   a. It demands that we enact and enforce Senator Douglas's new sedition law.
   b. It demands that we return fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. (124)
IV. The South will soon demand the overthrow of our free-state constitutions. (125) For
   a. The very existence of free-state constitutions declares the wrong of slavery. (125)
   b. The South must logically demand a full national recognition of slavery as a legal right and a social blessing. (125)

CONCLUSION.

A. The fundamental Republican position is that slavery is wrong. (125)
B. Republicans can afford to let slavery alone where it is from necessity.
C. Republicans must resist the spread of slavery into the national territories and free states.
D. Republicans must not be diverted by the sophistries of their opponents.
E. Republicans must not be frightened from their duty by slanderous accusations or threats of disunion.

THE RESULT.

The Cooper Institute address made it clear that Lincoln might easily become a formidable opponent of Seward's for the Republican presidential nomination. The address was reprinted many times in newspapers and pamphlets in the campaigns that followed. It supplied a complete political philosophy for the Republican Party; a safer philosophy than that offered by Seward with his doctrine of "the higher law" and "the irrepressible conflict." Lincoln seemed to say, "There is no need of appeal to any law higher than the Constitution; return to the views of the Fathers as to slavery; there will be no conflict unless it is forced upon us by the South. Slavery will die out if we prevent its extension." From New York Lincoln

went to Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire and Connecticut, where he made speeches for the Republican Party. In May, 1860, Lincoln was nominated for the presidency, over Seward, by the Republican National Convention at Chicago, and in November was elected, the electoral vote standing: Lincoln, 180; Breckenridge, 72; Bell, 39; Douglas, 12. The secession of the southern states followed in December, January and February, and Jefferson Davis was inaugurated President of the Southern Confederacy, February 18, 1861, Lincoln's inauguration following March 4. After Sumter was fired on Senator Douglas called on President Lincoln and pledged his support. By this patriotic act Douglas left no doubt among his northern followers of his entire devotion to the Union and as to their duty in the crisis. He prevented the calamity of a divided North.

ADDRESS AT INDEPENDENCE HALL.

Mr. Lincoln had spoken his brief but touching farewell to his Springfield neighbors, February 11, 1861, and had started for Washington. After stopping at various points to make speeches, he had reached Philadelphia, where he was to assist at a flag-raising. The secession of Southern states, the demoralization of the Buchanan Administration at Washington, the timid attitude of the North, and of Congress, were post-election developments. Through these, the issues on which Lincoln had won the election had suddenly become obsolete. The issue was now no longer anti-slavery, but the Union and how to save it. The Independence Hall speech recognizes this great change of issues (p. 128, ll. 5-7, ll. 19-21; p. 129, ll. 3-10), and the Union is Lincoln's theme from this time on. The place suggested the central idea, "The Declaration of Independence furnishes the principle on which the Union must be saved." While hundreds of influential but timid Northerners were, at the moment, ready to yield any and all principles in order to pacify the South, here was a strong declaration from the President-elect, that there would be no war unless it was forced upon the government. The effect of this address was to hearten the North and to impress the South with the fact that Lincoln was in no sense doubtful as to the duty before him. In connection with the last sentence of the address it should be remembered that there were credible rumors of a plot to assassinate Lincoln as he should pass through Baltimore on the next day or two. The plot, if it existed, was frustrated by making the journey earlier than the time announced, and Lincoln entered Washington February 23d, unharmed.

THE FIRST INAUGURAL.

This, the most momentous utterance in our history, left no doubt that the real issue was now union or disunion, and of the firm course President Lincoln would take. "The union of these states is perpetual"; "No state upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union"; "I shall take care that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the states"; "The central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy"; "The power confided in me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts"; "You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect and defend' it,"—these direct, simple, firm, and earnest sentences, impossible to misunderstand, meant that the seceded states must either abandon their project or make war to maintain it. By the most persuasive pleas and reasonings they were solicited to abandon their project. They are first assured (pp. 130, 131) that Republican success does not mean danger to slavery in the Southern states; that the President deems the enactment of a Fugitive Slave Law a constitutional obligation binding on Congress (pp. 131, 132). Indeed he makes suggestions for improving the existing law (p. 132, ll. 18-26). Then follow the open acknowledgment that an attempt is being made to disrupt the Union (p. 133) and the argument that the Union is perpetual and secession ordinances void (p. 134); the duty and intentions of the President (pp. 134, 135); the plea to those who love the Union (pp. 135, 136); the lack of real grievances against the government (p. 136); the reduction of secession to a logical absurdity (p. 137); the true attitude of the citizen towards the Supreme Court (p. 138); the folly of secession (pp. 138, 139); Lincoln's willingness that the Constitution should be amended (pp. 139, 140); the appeal to faith in the triumph of the right (p. 140); the appeal to old friendship and to patriotism (pp. 141, 142). In an earlier draft of the inaugural the word *nothing* was used for the word *void* (p. 134, l. 16), the word *treasonable* instead of the word *revolutionary* (p. 134, l. 18). The clauses *in view of the Constitution and the laws* (p. 134, l. 19) and *as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me* (p. 134, l. 21) were omitted; *tangible way* was used for *authoritative manner* (p. 134, l. 27) and the last line of the paragraph (p. 134, l. 30) read, *that it will have its own and defend itself*. (The student will find it instructive to consider what difference in implication there is between the word rejected and the word adopted in each case and to account for the alterations adopted by Lincoln.)

The original draft of the final paragraphs (p. 141) read as follows: "My dissatisfied fellow-countrymen; you cannot forbear the assault upon it; I cannot shrink from the defense of it. With you, and not with me, is the solemn question of Shall it be peace or a sword?" To this Mr. Seward objected on the ground that "something besides or in addition to argument is needful—to meet and remove prejudice and passion in the South and despondency and fear in the East. Some words of affection—some of the calm and cheerful confidence." Mr. Seward proposed the following: "I close. We are not, we must not be, aliens or enemies, but fellow-countrymen and brethren. Although passion has strained our bonds of affection too hardly, they must not, I am sure they will not, be broken. The mystic chords which, proceeding from so many battle-fields and so many patriot graves, pass through all the hearts and all the hearths in this broad continent of ours, will yet again harmonize in their ancient music when breathed upon by the guardian angel of the nation." Compare these versions with the text finally adopted by Mr. Lincoln and account for the alterations. Lincoln's fine precision in the use of words, his sense for choosing words with the association desired, his gift for direct statement, his ability to make every sentence say and imply no more and no less than he meant it to say and imply, can be illustrated on every page of this inaugural. He attributed his power over language to the fact that he never was satisfied with an idea until he had put it in language "plain enough for any boy to comprehend." The tone is firm but kindly, the spirit breathes native greatness and honesty of intention.

THE LETTER TO GREELEY.

In spite of the clear statement of the First Inaugural that the supreme issue was not now anti-slavery but the saving of the Union, many of Lincoln's supporters continued to think of the war only in its bearings on slavery. The radicals were zealous to destroy slavery at once; the conservatives were willing to preserve it. Each faction was eager to criticise every act of the administration with sole reference to the effect on slavery. Lincoln was on record as saying that he believed the Union could not permanently endure half-slave and half-free. He was known to hate human slavery. It might be inferred that when convinced of the necessity of emancipation as a war measure, solely in order to save the Union, he would proclaim freedom to the slave. He was meditating whether the hour had not arrived and had discussed the subject with his Cabinet July 22, 1862. But he

had laid the proclamation aside awaiting Union victories. These did not come; and the radicals were more bitter in their criticism of his "inaction" than ever. August 20, 1862, the New York Tribune, Greeley's paper, printed an open letter to Abraham Lincoln signed by Horace Greeley charging the President with not executing the laws energetically, with not carrying forward emancipation; with not taking counsel with radicals instead of conservatives, with acting timidly, with deferring to Southern sentiment, and with much more to the same purport. The purpose of Lincoln's reply was to restrain the impatience of those enthusiasts who felt as Greeley wrote, and to turn Greeley's letter to account in making public sentiment ready for emancipation. Lincoln aimed to go no faster in the direction of emancipation than he felt sure public opinion would warrant. There was for Lincoln every provocation to anger at the injustice of Greeley's letter; every incitement to reveal in detail his own plan for emancipation, and to make a promise on the subject. But Lincoln refused to yield to impulses of that kind. With rare magnanimity he overlooked the personal injustice, with rare dignity he denied himself the justification that a word might have afforded, refused to enter a controversy, refused to discomfit his accuser, and prepared the public mind for the proclamation which was published September 23d.

THE SPEECH AT GETTYSBURG.

This brief speech should be memorized and made a permanent possession. Of the same quality in tone, spirit, and perfect expression, is the following letter to Mrs. Bixby, of Boston:

Dear Madam:—I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts, that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Very respectfully yours,

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

THE SECOND INAUGURAL.

By the time of the second inaugural the military success of the Federal arms was assured, the Union was probably saved, and slavery was being destroyed by the victorious advance of the Union armies. For those now defeated, who had brought on the war, the great heart of Lincoln contained nothing but forgiveness. His fear was that the spirit of revenge which had begun to appear in Congress would dictate too harsh terms to the conquered and would perpetuate hatred and make real reconciliation impossible between the two sections of the country. The second inaugural address is the most magnanimous of American state papers. Its final sentence might stand as the epitaph of the writer. "This speech," says Morse, "has taken its place among the most famous of all the written or spoken compositions in the English language. In parts it has often been compared with the lofty portions of the Old Testament. Mr. Lincoln's own contemporaneous criticism is interesting. "I expect it," he said, "to wear as well as, perhaps better than, anything I have produced; but I believe it is not immediately popular. Men are not flattered by being shown that there has been a difference of purpose between the Almighty and them. To deny it, however, in this case, is to deny that there is a God governing the world. It is the truth which I thought needed to be told; and as whatever of humiliation there is in it falls most directly on myself, I thought others might afford for me to tell it." The address puts on the war an interpretation (p. 147, l. 16—p. 148, l. 15) at once the highest, the profoundest, and the most magnanimous, rising above all controversies as to the relative blame of the North and the South for bringing on the scourge; it is divine retribution upon the whole nation for permitting a great wrong to continue for so many years. In this interpretation Lincoln anticipated the best judgment which history has pronounced in explanation of this and other similar conflicts of the world, notably the French Revolution. The deeply religious tone, the awe and the mystery of it, indicate the humble spirit in which Lincoln would have the nation proceed to the work of restoration and reconciliation that remained to be accomplished. In connection with p. 147, l. 19 read *Genesis* 3:19; with l. 20, *Matthew* 7:1; with ll. 23-25, *Matthew* 18:7; with p. 148, l. 7, *Psalm* 19:9; with l. 11, *Isaiah* 61:1 and *Isaiah* 30:26; with l. 12, *Matthew* 20:12; with l. 13, *Psalm* 146:9.

LAST PUBLIC ADDRESS.

For the various theories of reconstruction,—the restoration or presidential theory, conquered territory theory, state suicide theory, etc., see Lalor's *Cyclopedia of Political Science and United States History,* article on *Reconstruction.* Reconstruction brought greater embarrassments than secession had brought, and aroused passions quite as fierce. The President was attacked for exercising powers that were claimed for Congress alone and for offering terms too lenient to the Southern States. The spirit of revenge, which Lincoln had feared, gained headway in Congress. The speech was delivered to a multitude that had gathered in the evening of April 11, before the White House, to express enthusiasm over the fall of Petersburg and Richmond and the surrender of Lee. It begins by generously attributing to Grant and the army all of the honor of the victory and then calmly, without the slightest hint of irritation at unjust criticism, appeals by argument and explanation for support of the humane and liberal policy in Louisiana, which was already bitterly assailed by politicians of his own party. Reasonableness, benignity, honesty of intention, greatness of heart, characterize the utterance. But so do practical sagacity, homely wisdom, and simplicity. Lincoln touched no difficult subject in his life without simplifying it by his statement. He brushes aside the fine spun theories of reconstruction with which men had befogged their minds and calls attention to the one purpose for which all should work (p. 152, ll. 6-21). Two weeks after this speech Lincoln was assassinated by John Wilkes Booth, who, in the words of Morse, "slew the only sincere and powerful friend whom the Southerners had among their conquerors."

THE LONDON SPECTATOR ON LINCOLN.

Of the countless tributes to the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, none are more instructive to the American than those coming from foreign sources. That quoted in the text is especially noteworthy for its analysis of Lincoln's literary power, as well as for its true insight into his character. Cite from the speeches of Lincoln in this volume passages that verify the points made by the London *Spectator.* Cite an example of persuasion arising from the order in which Lincoln arranges the topics of his discourse. Cite from Lincoln a case of refutation; a case of persuasion arising from logic alone; several memorable maxims of government.

MACAULAY ON COPYRIGHT.

THE SPEAKER.

Thomas Babington Macaulay was born in the year 1800 in Leicestershire, England. From his earliest years he gave promise of eminence in literature. At eighteen he went to Trinity College, Oxford, where he gained distinction as a debater and a writer. He received his degree in 1822 and two years later was appointed to a fellowship. The first publication to bring him into notice was the article on Milton, which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for August, 1825. This was first of a long series of essays by Macaulay which appeared in the same journal during the next twenty years. It gave him fame, social distinction, and political opportunity. He was called to the bar in 1828 and in 1830 was sent to Parliament as a Whig. The great movement for reform was in full tide and Macaulay was in complete sympathy with it. He entered into the debates with ardor and proved to be an effective and highly interesting orator. When, in 1832, the great reform was achieved, Macaulay was returned to Parliament from Leeds. On all of the questions of the time Macaulay spoke on the progressive side—in favor of removing the civil disabilities of the Jews, against the exclusive trade privileges of the East India Company, against repealing the union with Ireland. In 1834 he was appointed President of the Law Commission for India and a member of the Supreme Council of Calcutta, at a very large salary. While in India he drew up a Penal Code for that country. On returning from India he was again called to Parliament, serving from 1839 to 1847. During these eight years he was a frequent debater on important measures, defending the war with China, opposing Chartism, favoring the abolishment of theological tests in Scotch universities, advocating shorter hours for young employes in factories, resisting the attempt to deprive dissenters of their chapels, and advocating a rational copyright law. In 1842 appeared the "Lays of Ancient Rome," and two years later the last of the popular essays in the *Edinburgh Review*, that first won and still perpetuate his fame. His history of England appeared, two volumes in 1848 and two in 1855. Its sale was enormous. No man had ever before written history in so picturesque and entertaining a manner. While writing the history he also contributed several articles on great Englishmen to the *Encyclopedia Brittanica*. In 1857 he was made a peer, Baron Macaulay of Rothley, the first literary man to receive such a distinction. He died in 1859.

THE OCCASION.

The law of 1814 provided that the term of copyright should be twenty-eight years, reckoned from the date of publication. The law as it stood when this speech was delivered terminated a copyright with the author's death. It was now proposed to extend the term of copyright sixty years beyond the death of the author. The proposal was largely the result of sympathy for the distressed families of famous authors. Sir Walter Scott's family was about to lose the income from *Waverley* through expiration of copyright. Southey announced that he should write henceforth only for immediate returns. Carlyle petitioned the House of Commons to extend the term of copyright. No wonder that Macaulay, the prosperous and popular essayist who always won large immediate rewards for his writing, hesitated to oppose the measure for extension of the copyright term, for fear of being thought unmindful of less fortunate literary men, the best of whom could not hope to win popular favor for many years. Macaulay, however, braved this danger of being misjudged, for he believed that the bill would not accomplish the benevolent purpose intended by its advocates. Macaulay's sincerity and nobility cannot be doubted. Had the Talfourd Bill become law, Macaulay and his heirs would have profited more than any others of the English writers and their families. For his works have sold in enormous quantities both before and since his death, and the copyright on them would continue until the year 1920. It was doubtless very hard for Macaulay to put himself in the position of apparent unfriendliness to other literary people. He is entitled to great respect for setting aside that consideration and for viewing the question as a statesman. Though greatly disappointed and defeated by this speech, the advocates of more liberal terms of copyright tried again the next year with a bill giving copyright protection for twenty-five years, reckoned from the date of death. The bill seemed likely to pass, until Macaulay brought forward a counter proposal giving protection for forty-two years reckoned from the date of publication. This proposal he advocated in a brilliant and convincing speech and it was adopted.

QUALITIES OF THE SPEECH.

(a) The divisions and subdivisions of this speech are very clearly marked. Macaulay's proposition is found on page 163, line 4; it is repeated in a different form on page 166, lines 11 and 33, and page 170, line 9. It is at the last-named sentence that the real argument begins. The introduction consists

first of a paragraph announcing his personal disinclination to speak; secondly, of three paragraphs dealing with the preliminary question whether property, and especially copyright, is a natural right, or is created by legislation and therefore to be regulated merely as a matter of expediency; and thirdly (page 167, line 5, to page 170, line 9), of a discussion of copyright as a necessary evil: necessary, because authors must be remunerated and the only other way of remuneration is the pernicious system of patronage; an evil, because copyright is monopoly. There are five points in the main argument: first (page 170, line 9, to page 173, line 20) that the benefit of a sixty-years posthumous copyright to the author will be very slight as compared with the heavy tax imposed upon the book buying public; secondly (page 173, line 21, to page 176, line 28) that the expected benefit to an author's descendants will be very slight compared with the immense burden on the public; thirdly (page 176, line 29, to page 182, line 3) that there is great danger that many valuable works would be suppressed or mutilated if an author's copyright should remain a monopoly in his family for sixty years after his death; fourthly (page 182, line 4, to page 183, line 3) that such a law would be demoralizing in its public effect because it would lead to wholesale law-breaking; and fifthly, that it would ultimately result in the repeal of all copyright protection. The conclusion is the last three lines of the speech,—the motion to postpone. The first characteristic of the speech, then, is clearness of division and subdivision.

(b) The second characteristic is the concreteness of the argument. Each point is established by real and specific examples taken from history. In establishing the preliminary argument that the succession to property is not by natural or divine right, Macaulay cites (page 165) not one or two but a dozen specific instances of variation from the general rule through custom or legislation, and then asks which one of these is the natural law or divine law of the case. Likewise in discussing patronage (page 168) he supplies a formidable array of names of celebrated patrons of men of letters. In discussing monopoly (pages 168-170) Macaulay gives us numerous specific instances of true theories and historical examples of evil monopolies. These are real comparisons, parallel or analogous cases by which he reduces to an absurdity the assertion of his opponent concerning the effect of monopoly. In fact, the concrete example, or specific instance, is Macaulay's chief argumentative weapon throughout the speech. [See pages 171, 173, 174, 178 (Richardson's grandson), 179 (Boswell's son), 180 (Wesley), 181 (Book of Common Prayer).]

(c) A third characteristic is Macaulay's frequent use of

the summarizing sentence or an equivalent in closing his discussion of a point. [See page 166, lines 14-18; page 168, lines 15-18; page 170, lines 2-5; page 172, lines 18-21; page 173, lines 18-20; page 175, lines 3-7; page 176, lines 23-28; page 179, lines 19-22; page 180, lines 5-7; page 181, line 33, to page 182, line 3; page 182, line 29, to page 183, line 3.]

(d) The frequency with which Macaulay uses the rhetorical question is also to be noted. [See especially page 165, lines 24-33; page 169, lines 6-8, 13-23; page 171, lines 26-33; page 172, line 13; page 176, line 18; page 179, line 1, 9-12; page 180, line 4.] It is also noticeable that there is climax in his arrangement of his principal arguments.

Make a complete brief of the speech, following the form of the brief given on pp. 195-201.

HELPS TO STUDY

HELPS TO STUDY

(Adapted, and enlarged, from the *Manual for the Study of English Classics*, by George L. Marsh)

The Study of Speeches

What practical reasons are there for studying speeches (pp. 9, 10)?

What classifications of public address may there be, and which kind seems best adapted to conditions of the present day (pp. 11-14)?

What reasons are there for a speaker's paying special attention to the sort of audience he is to have (pp. 12, 13)?

What influence has the fact that a work is intended for oral delivery (pp. 14, 15)?

What are some present dominant fashions in speech-making (p. 16)? What are the main points in the training of Demosthenes that are useful at the present time (pp. 18, 19)?

What are some of the most useful matters to be included in the introduction to a speech (p. 22)?

What does definition mean for the purposes of spoken discourse (p. 28)? What other principal elements may enter into the body of a discourse (pp. 29-34)?

What is the main function of the conclusion of a speech (p. 34)?

Test all the foregoing matters of structure by study of the speeches included in the volume.

Washington's Farewell

See the editor's questions and exercises (pp. 186-89).

When was this address written (p. 184)? How long had Washington been president? Had he sought the office? Had there been other candidates for it?

What do you think of the apology for proceeding—"Here, perhaps, I ought to stop"—so near the beginning (p. 38)?

What "occasion" is alluded to at the end of paragraph 7 (p. 38)?

What reasons were there for the first main topic of Washington's discussion (p. 185)?

What was the extent of the United States at the time Washington wrote this address? For example, what did he mean by the West? Compare the extent of the country then with its extent now—especially in view of the question at lines 15, 16, page 41.

Is Washington's argument on this point sound at the present time? Are there ever occasions for repetition of it now? What bearing has this part of the speech on the Civil War?

What were the most important terms of the treaties mentioned on page 42?

What is Washington's argument for a strong central government (pp. 42, 43)? How does it apply today in relation to certain practical measures—railroad regulation, for instance; child labor; pure food, etc.?

What dangers does Washington see in party spirit (pp. 45 ff.)?

What experiences suggested his advice about taxation (p. 186)?

What nations must he have had in mind on pages 49, 50? Compare our general attitude at present. What are Washington's arguments for neutrality in relations with other nations (pp. 52 ff.)?

What is to be said of the conclusion of the address (p. 186)?

Perry Pictures 112 and 112B are portraits of Washington; 1409-16 illustrate his career rather fully.

Webster on Washington

Perry Picture 144 is a portrait of Webster.

What was Webster's position in the country, and what had been his principal achievements, at the time of the delivery of the address on Washington (p. 187)?

What were some of the most important events of the century from Washington's birth to the date of Webster's address (pp. 58 ff.)?

What are the "various topics of the address" mentioned near the bottom of page 188, the beginning of each of which is indicated by a page number?

What influence does Webster attribute to the example of American liberty (p. 62)?

What attempted interference is alluded to in line 23, page 65?

For what qualities does Webster praise Washington's Farewell Address (p. 66)? Note differences in tone and style between Webster's and Washington's speeches—the latter extremely matter-of-fact and unornamented; the former ornate, figurative.

From what is Webster really quoting at line 10, page 67?

How does Webster say Washington chose men for office (pp. 67, 68)? Is this like the manner of choice now?

What undercurrent of allusion to conditions of his own time is there in Webster's address? Specific places should be pointed out and explained (e. g., p. 71).

Point out characteristics of the speech especially suited to oral delivery.

The Bunker Hill Monument

Perry Picture 1384 is of the Bunker Hill Monument.

What was the history of the erection of the monument (p. 189)?

Why are there allusions to Columbus, Plymouth, etc. (pp. 75, 76; see the outline on pp. 24, 25)? What colony is alluded to in lines 4, 5, page 76? Why should there be recital of the great events of the last fifty years (pp. 79 ff.)?

What is the substance of Webster's statement of the purpose of the monument—the need for it (p. 77)?

Note the skillful transition to the address to the survivors (p. 80).

Who is meant near the top of page 82—and why? What do you think of the repeated use of "him," followed by the second person?

What were the main events leading directly to the battle of Bunker Hill (pp. 84 ff.)? Its chief direct results (pp. 86 ff.)?

Just how is the eulogy of Lafayette introduced, and why (p. 87)? What had he done to deserve such a eulogy? How old was he at this time?

Is there any objectionable element of repetition in returning to the great changes of the last fifty years (p. 89; cf. p. 79)?

What important contrasts between the American and the French Revolution does Webster express or imply (pp. 92 ff.)? How are they accounted for?

Point out striking maxims of government (e. g., p. 94, l. 8). Compare with Burke's tendency to present similar maxims.

What was the status in Greece when Webster made this speech (pp. 95, 191)? Note that this was just a year after Byron died aiding the Greeks.

Look up more precisely the history of the independence of the South American states (reference p. 191).

What is Webster's concluding thought? How may the main burden of the speech be expressed in a sentence or two (pp. 26, 27)?

Point out other examples of the "echo" for the sake of coherence, besides those mentioned on page 190.

Discuss the climaxes mentioned on page 28. Are there any others? Why should these climaxes occur?

Speeches by Lincoln

Perry Pictures 125, 1419-21, and 1423 have to do with Lincoln.

What was Lincoln's position in the nation at the time of his Cooper Institute speech (p. 192)? What was the general political situation in the country?

Study carefully, in close connection with the speech, the brief on pages 195-201.

What was Lincoln's purpose in making so many repetitions as are to be found in this speech? Do you think they become tiresome; or do they increase the convincingness of the argument? Specify the groups of words that are most often repeated.

Do you find any trace of Lincoln's wit and humor in this speech? What about sarcasm?

What were the results of this speech (pp. 201-2)? Sum up reasons you find, in the qualities of the speech, to account for such results.

What was the occasion of the speech at Independence Hall (p. 202)? The personal danger alluded to at the end? What is the application of the "principle or idea" from the Declaration of Independence, which Lincoln mentions, to the conditions then confronting the country (p. 128)?

Study the historical background of Lincoln's First Inaugural Address. How far had the movement toward secession gone at the time of its delivery? Note the analysis given on pages 203-4; work it over into an outline or a brief. Is the order perfectly logical? Convincing? Note the variations of the final draft from earlier drafts. Try to find reasons for the changes and decide whether there has been improvement in every case.

What was the direct occasion of Lincoln's Letter to Greeley (p. 205)? Note the peculiar effectiveness of the introduction, in its refusal to be diverted from the main issue, while at the same time it indicates that an injustice has been done. What is the effect of the repetitions, the balanced structure, the extreme simplicity and directness?

Note the marked poetic quality of the Speech at Gettysburg (p. 145)—a genuine prose poem.

To what extent does the Second Inaugural Address sum up and interpret the war (p. 206)? What was the status of the war, and the prospect, when this address was delivered? How soon was the war actually ended? And how soon was Lincoln assassinated? Discuss the general estimate of the speech by your editor. Are there places where rhythm (even rhyme), too much like the rhythm of poetry, may be found (e. g., bottom p. 147, top p. 148)?

What was the occasion of Lincoln's last public address (p. 207)? What important principles with relation to reconstruction does it suggest?

Study the comment on Lincoln (pp. 155-162) in the manner suggested on page 207.

Macaulay on Copyright

When was this speech delivered (p. 163)? What was Macaulay's position in literature at this time (p. 208)? See the Lake Classics editions of various essays by him.

Sum up the provisions of the copyright bill Macaulay was opposing (p. 209), and compare them with present provisions as to copyright, both in the United States and internationally.

Work the analysis on pages 209-10 into the form of a brief according to the model on pages 195-201.

What comparative estimate of Richardson and Fielding is implied in this speech (pp. 177-179)? Is it the prevailing estimate now? For interesting comment on Fielding see Thackeray's *English Humorists,* Lake Classics edition.

Find other literary estimates expressed or implied in the speech. Do any of them surprise you or seem peculiar? Why should Boswell's son have disliked his father's *Life of Johnson?*

What was the result of Macaulay's argument (p. 209)?

THEME SUBJECTS

1. A sketch of Washington's life (see books referred to, pp. 185-6).

2. Washington as president (see Webster's speech, pp. 56 ff.).

3. Washington's reasons for not wanting a third term. (Do such reasons apply now?)

4. The condition of the country at the time of Washington's Farewell.

5. Application of the main points of Washington's address (as to party spirit or foreign relations, for instance) to the present time.

6. The career of Daniel Webster (see references on p. 187).

7. Summary of the main points of Webster's address on Washington.

8. A simple account of the Battle of Bunker Hill.

9. The main achievements from 1775 to 1825 (pp. 79, 89 ff.).

10. Why Lafayette appears in Webster's speech.

11. The life of Lincoln.

12. Lincoln and Douglas.

13. A summary of the Cooper Institute speech (on the basis of the capital-lettered parts of the brief, pp. 196-201).

14. The historical situation at the time of Lincoln's first inauguration.

15. Summary of Lincoln's arguments against secession (pp. 133 ff.).

16. Lincoln's character as indicated in the selections printed.

17. The historical situation at the time of Lincoln's second inauguration (p. 206).

18. The advantages of Lincoln's plan of reconstruction (pp. 152 ff.).

19. A summary of Macaulay's argument against the Talfourd copyright bill (pp. 163-183).

20. An answer to Macaulay's argument, as Talfourd might have made it.

SELECTIONS FOR CLASS READING

1. Washington's introduction (pp. 35-37).
2. On party spirit (pp. 41-46).
3. On foreign relations (pp. 49-53).
4. Washington's conclusion (p. 55).
5. Webster's introduction as to Washington (pp. 56-58).
6. The growth of freedom (pp. 59-62).
7. The principles of Washington's administration (pp. 63, 64).
8. Webster's conclusion as to Washington (pp. 69-73).
9. The purpose of the Bunker Hill monument (pp. 76-78).
10. Webster's address to the survivors (pp. 80-83).
11. The changes of fifty years (pp. 89-95).
12. Conclusion of the Bunker Hill oration (pp. 97-99).
13. *A reductio ad absurdum* (pp. 108-112).
14. A southern threat answered (pp. 120-123).
15. Lincoln on the permanency of the Union (pp. 133-137).
16. The conclusion of Lincoln's First Inaugural Address (pp. 139-142).
17. Lincoln's Letter to Greeley (pp. 143-4).
18. The Speech at Gettysburg (p. 145).
19. Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address (pp. 146-148).
20. Views on reconstruction (pp. 152-154).
21. Copyright as monopoly (pp. 167-173).

DERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA

Angeline

ANDERSON COLLEGE
LIBRARY
ANDERSON, INDIANA

a7S23

Locker 556

Miss Miller
Advisor

L.C.
mt.